THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. XI.—JANUARY, 1886.—No. 41.

CHURCH AND STATE—IN ENGLAND.

WILL the question of disestablishing the Church of England be brought into prominence in the present Parliament? Probably not. It will be just sufficiently "used" by the Radical party for the advancement of their own Radical repute; but the country is not ready, the time is not ripe, for such a sweeping, revolutionary measure. Yet, as the question has been already gravely mooted; much discussed both by Anglicans and Dissenters; and as Mr. Gladstone has said that he "foresees it to be one of the causes of angry strife in times to come;" it may be opportune—and it can hardly be uninteresting—to seek answers to the following five questions:

(1.) Politically, what are the bearings of disestablishment? (2) Financially, how does the matter stand in equity? (3) Sympathetically, how do Churchmen view the change? (4) Inimically, how do Dissenters view the change? (5) Is the whole scope, or balance, of the arguments in favor of the pruning knife or of the axe?

I.

Politically, it may be affirmed without misgiving, or without the least fear of sinning against charity, that the whole question will be viewed with reference to party interests, and without reference to (or with little care for) right or wrong. If this statement

seems too hard or too harsh, let us take Mr. Chamberlain's "attitude" at Glascow, when discussing the disestablishment of the Scotch Kirk. He posed as a disestablisher pure and simple. He posed also as a disendower pure and simple. He argued that the vast endowments were originally intended for other purposes than those now approved; and, therefore, that, politically, religiously, morally, the endowments should be re-devoted to their first purposes. So far so good, and we can follow him. But now comes this "*volte-face* of principle": that forasmuch as disestablishment, if insisted on by Liberals, would create a trump-card of alarm for the Tory party, therefore this question, "under *all* the circumstances (the chief "circumstance" being the injury to the Liberal party) must not be made "an indispensable condition." This was certainly a confession of weak principle. It was suggestive of the attitude, "*dat ut dent;*" or rather of *not* giving what might cost something. Yet here it must be noted that disestablishment in Scotland would be quite distinct from disestablishment in England; and we are only quoting Mr. Chamberlain as showing that party interests *may* take precedence (in certain cases) of right or wrong. Disestablishment in Scotland would be little more than a taking away what was given, two centuries ago, to the Kirk. The Presbyterian Kirk was a brand new Institution, which had *no* ancestry—doctrinally or politically—before Presbyterianism was invented; and it was by favor of Dutch William that it got possession of the funds which belonged previously to the Episcopal Church. In the eyes of all Anglicans, the Episcopal Church of Scotland is the more orthodox, the more "Catholic" Institution; so that the splendid present which was made by Dutch William to the Communion of the enthusiastic John Knox was, at the least, a spoliation of (truer) heirs. Very different is the case of the Church of England. Her endowments are mostly private benefactions; nor has the State created endowments for her at all. And, besides this, it must be remembered that the sums spent by English Churchmen, in the single matter of the education of the poor, relieve the State, and have always relieved it, of a vast annual burden on the Exchequer. There are, therefore, very considerable differences between the two rival Communions. Yet these differences do not seem to affect "principles." What Mr. Chamberlain pleaded in Scotland most Liberals would plead as gravely in England—in regard to the whole question of disestablishment: that the Tory party would make capital out of an election cry which should propose to lay hands on the National Church. Did not Mr. Gladstone seem to imply this in his manifesto? "I think it is obvious," he wrote, "that so vast a question cannot become practical until it shall have grown to the public mind by thorough

discussion." It is true that these words mean just nothing at all, so far as "religious principles" are concerned; but they do mean that, politically, it would be a very hazardous game to play—to attack an institution loved by Tories. What the "principles" of the Liberal party are, in regard to the whole subject, we may gather from the statements of Liberal organs. Out of about 580 Liberal candidates, more than 400 (say these organs) "are in favor of disestablishment on principle." And if we consult the "religious" organs of the Church party,—and the *Guardian* newspaper is perhaps their favorite organ,—we find that a number of "root and branch disestablishers" are undecided on the question of "opportunism." Now it is very amusing to find the *Guardian* trying to reconcile Liberal principles with the duty of supporting Church and State. All that it demands is, that the Liberals ought not, in the "next Parliament," to vote against the interests of the Church. "Your duty," says the *Guardian* to the Liberal voters, "takes you so far as refusing to vote for the anti-Church Liberal, but it takes you no farther. You are not bound to give your vote to the man who is pledged to support the Church if he chances to be a Conservative." So that we cannot be called hard or harsh, in the statement which we made at the beginning, that the whole question will be viewed with reference to party interests, and without reference to (or with little care for) right or wrong." If the most reputable of the Anglican organs—speaking, of course, Anglicanly—places political expediency above principle, secular Liberals (*a fortiori* secular Radicals) cannot be expected to be painfully conscientious.

Yet this question of "principle" is the more gravely important because it must affect many measures. Religious education, the marriage laws, and also socialism, *must* come before Parliament in the next five years. Now, if this "principle" is to be approved (and the *Guardian* newspaper clearly approves it), of being "a politician first, then a churchman," it will go hard with the religious interests of all these questions. No doubt a large number of members of Parliament are themselves absolutely indifferent on all such subjects; they are a sort of Gallios, who care for none of these things; or, if Liberals, they will adopt the politic principle, "*Amica veritas, magis amicus Gladstone;*" yet it is difficult to believe that political gentlemen of any school can actually vote for what, on principle, they think wrong. It is more likely that they will try to shift the bearings of the question, so as to make them *seem* to be more statistical than they are moral; and this will not be difficult to be done. It will only be necessary to talk glibly about the "abuses" of the present system, and about the "great saving" to the country through wiser uses. And at this point let us glance

at the financial aspect, so as to see how it may be made to look like "pure politics."

II.

First, we will take the amounts of church property. The endowments have been (ordinarily) computed to be of the value of two hundred millions sterling; the gross revenues, six millions; the income of the parochial clergy, four and a half millions. The bishops' incomes are about a hundred and fifty thousand. [The Archbishop of Canterbury has fifteen thousand; the Archbishop of York has ten thousand, and so has the Bishop of London.] The total annual value of the cathedral property may be put down as about three hundred and fifty thousand.

And now, to consider such facts relatively: When the census of religious worship was taken, in 1851, it was found that with a population in England and Wales of 17,927,609, the estimated total number of attendants at public worship on the census-Sunday was only 7,261,032. Of that number, 3,773,474 were present at the services of the Established Church, and 3,487,558 at the services of other religious bodies. In Wales, more than three-fourths of the service-attending population were found to be some sort of Non-conformists. And here it must be remarked in regard to Wales, that whereas the whole of the population a hundred and fifty years ago were professing members of the Anglican Establishment, at the present day fully eighty-four per cent. profess some sort of Protestant dissent.

And now, to say a word as to church buildings: It was stated in the census-returns of 1851, that out of a total of 14,077 churches, 9,667 had been built before the year 1807. How many were built before the time of Queen Elizabeth? was an inquiry that the Commissioners did not institute. But it is a notable fact that between 1801 and 1851, 4,410 churches were built; which shows that an immense proportion of existing (Anglican) churches must be acknowledged to be non-Catholic property. This is a very important item in the controversy, and somewhat simplifies the difficulties as to "justice;" for with the exception of the cathedrals, and a certain number of parish churches, the greater part of the Anglican church property never was Catholic in any sense. We are glad for the future Commissioners that this should be so; yet should disestablishment ever come to be worked out, the cost of compensation would be gigantic. Indeed, Mr. Gladstone has computed that between the incomes, private endowments, and the value of fabrics and advowsons, something like ninety million pounds sterling would have to be given, in the process of disestablishment, to the ministers, members, and patrons of the Church of England.

Finally, since mere statistics are not important, as much affecting "first principles in regard to justice," it may be said that the actual revenues of the Establishment (or, more accurately, the actual sums which she enjoys) are:

Archbishops and Bishops,	£158,000
Cathedrals,	350,000
Parochial Benefices,	4,500,000
Parliamentary and other grants,	100,000
Ecclesiastical Commission (net),	700,000
Queen Anne's Bounty (net),	130,000
Total,	£5,938,000

The financial argument, on the part of the disestablishers, may, therefore, be roughly put in this way: For about seven millions of so-called churchmen (many of whom do not profess any orthodoxy) there is an exclusive political forethought or recognition, and an endowment of about two hundred millions sterling; while the majority (considerably more than three-fourths, or not less than twenty-four millions of English subjects) are not established to the value of one penny. This is asserted by a large party to be unjust; yet, obviously, the question of financial justice would comprehend the most difficult inquiries, such as: Whence was the property first derived? Is its application such as was meant by the founder? How far does development in application negative prescriptive right to inheritance? Or: Can a precedent of three centuries totally obliterate Catholic right to possess at least Catholic foundations, just as in lay property it is allowed that long possession supersedes all earlier prescriptive rights? Such inquiries must be left to the law-judges, and to the learned in moral theology. It is more interesting at this time, and certainly it is more practical, to seek an answer to the more immediate question: "What do the members of the Church of England think or desire as to disestablishment?"

III.

The bishops and the wealthy dignitaries naturally take the same view; and five of the bishops have addressed pastorals to their clergy, urging them to rush to church defence. They have the best possible reasons for doing so. Primarily, there might be but little change to begin with, certainly not for the immediate generation; nor would there be any risk of "destitution." Social status would, however, be much jeopardized, because unquestionably to be a clergyman of a church over which the State throws a mantle of respectability is a different thing to being a clergyman of a church which would not be national (any more than one of the sects), but which must fall back on disputed claims for its supremacy.

High Churchism might attribute status to the Anglican clergy, and Ritualism might demand homage from its votaries; but disestablishment and disendowment would mean: "Now take care of yourselves, and do not trust to the royal supremacy for your position." Every-one knows that the social status of the Anglican clergy has been, for three centuries, their chief power; that their inter-marrying with the higher classes has fixed their place; that the pleasant rectory or the rich canonry has loomed—in the near distance—before the vision of every candidate for holy orders. The clergy would scarcely be human if they did not appreciate the advantages which have accrued from an assured social respectability. And, therefore, it is but natural that they should regard with disfavor the cutting off of the element of worldly boons.

But there is another point which is even a good deal more disquieting; and that is: the equivocal character of "the Church" itself. If you take away the favoring accidents of prosperity,—the distinction, the prestige, of State-churchism,—you compel the Anglican Church to fall back on its own authority; and everyone knows that that is *nil*. Even the extreme Ritualists are aware that, spite of their assumption, the laity laugh slyly at their authority; that even the most admiring of their devotees have a good deal more than a suspicion that there is something wrong in "the Anglo-Catholic Church." So that, professing their own superiority to State aid,—their supernatural vocation and office,—they yet in private, in the fellowship of their intimates, admit that it is much safer to be established. And their knowledge of their own church history supports this view. They know perfectly well that what was "established" in the National church was Anglican doctrines, not endowments; that in 1534 an Act of Parliament "established" the doctrinal (or spiritual) supremacy of the sovereign, giving him "power to redress errors and heresies;" that in 1558 another Act made Queen Elizabeth the Pope of her own brand new Institution; that in 1559 another Act compelled all Englishmen (spite of the protest of the whole Anglican Hierarchy) to believe in an Elizabethan Christianity; that in 1571 the Thirty-nine Articles were established, just as "Common Prayer" was established a little later; and that the word "established" was first applied to the perfectly new Anglican doctrines, and only afterwards to temporal affairs. Knowing these truths, even the most advanced modern clergy hardly like to be cut away from their moorings. They are bound, in consistency, to affect to be indifferent to what the world profanely calls "loaves and fishes;" yet the affectation is confined to "published matter." In private chat they tell you frankly: "It would be a great pity,—unless it were to spite those wealthy dignitaries."

The laity do not take the subject much to heart; that is, the great majority of them do not. There is, of course, a social, or say, connubial sense, in which the middle classes naturally feel interested; because there is scarcely a family, among the middle classes, which is not allied by intermarriage with one or more clerical families. The "new curate" has always been an object of domestic interest to most of the single ladies in every parish; and as marriage implies hopes of preferment, endowments are a very practical consideration. This view of disestablishment is but little discussed [the extreme Ritualists would resent any allusion to it, because they "do not approve of a married priesthood," theoretically], yet everyone knows that a married clergy implies, first, the means of getting married and keeping a family. It is, therefore, perfectly excusable, perfectly natural, to propose the painfully commercial inquiry: "Would the voluntary system *answer* in the Church of England?" And the experience would, probably, be of this kind: for "popular" clergymen it *would* answer; for "unpopular" clergymen it would *not*. So that popularity is not a reliable source of income. In former days popularity was everything for a clergyman—in the days when "sacerdotalism" was unknown. Indeed it may be said that the "success" of an Anglican curate used to depend mainly on his acceptability; on the charm of his preaching or of his manners. There was weakness and there was force in this arrangement. Popularity was the bane of Protestant Anglicanism; just as it was the one thing which sustained it.

That the bishops do not desire disestablishment, or that the wealthy dignitaries in all spheres do not desire it, we have assumed for a mere postulate of human nature. Few men who have a generous income would wish to exchange it for contributions. And here it may be noted that the very reason—at least, a principal reason—why dissenting ministers have been looked down upon by Anglicans, has been because they have been voluntarily supported. They have been alms-men; not established, endowed gentlemen. True, dissenting ministers have not been "educated," until quite recently, when they have built their own colleges; but the *tache* upon dissent has been the fact that it was not "recognized," not established, not endowed, by the Imperial Power. And at this point we may ask the question: What have the Dissenters got to say, as to the "justice" of the Establishment, or of its extinction?

IV.

To summarize their arguments would take a volume. Let us be as brief as it is possible. The arguments may be classified under three heads: The Historic, the Doctrinal, the Ethical.

Historically, Dissenters say to the Establishmentarians: Your

Church was the creature of Henry VIII., of Edward VI., of Elizabeth, of Charles II. By persecution alone have you maintained your Church; while *we* have always fought for religious liberty. Witness the fruits of *our* labors (fruits wrung from you through generations of resistance): The Toleration Acts, the Test and Corporation Acts, the Marriage Act, the Abolition of Church Rates, and the throwing open of the Universities to all comers. *You* have created dissent all over the world. You compelled the Puritans to found "churches" in the United States; the Nonconformists to inaugurate Congregationalism; the Oxford Methodists to cover the land with their conventicles; Whitefield and Wesley to turn Dissenters. And as to your "Church," in the ecclesiastical sense, it was not of ecclesiastical origin at all; for, though it was, at one time, of regal, at another time of parliamentary and regal, it was *never* of ecclesiastical inception. "Church and State" is a most falsifying conjunction; it is a misnomer, which defies historic facts; for your Church was never more than the State's servile agent to carry out its political will. Thus, historically, we dismiss you as the most patent ecclesiastical sham which the history of all religions can furnish.

Doctrinally, we cannot treat you any better. As to your superficial "unity," you have (and you always have had) more divisions within your sect than there are without it: High Churchmen and Low Churchmen, Broad Churchmen and No Churchmen, and (of late years) Extreme Ritualists and Rationalists, contending against the Bishops *and* the Law Courts. Even your "principle" of Establishmentism is proved doctrinally to be nonsense; for, in Great Britain, you have two separate establishments, the Anglo Episcopal and the Scotch Presbyterian; nor can your Queen's chaplains (the chaplains of your only Pope) officiate lawfully in both communions. Indeed, as to doctrines, you simply have none at all; for every clergyman makes his belief for himself, while every bishop trims his sails to the State-winds; and as to the laity, it is simply impossible to find two of them, in any parish, who are in accord on all their religious opinions. You might as well call the "tuning up" of an orchestra—before the conductor has begun to wield his imperial baton—a harmonious and exquisitely-timed concert, as call the myriad eccentricities of Anglican opinion a uniform system of belief.

Ethically, you are, if possible, in a still worse plight. Your method of Church patronage is so gross a public scandal that Simon Magus might have patented it for his own. The Prime Minister appoints your Bishops and Deans (well, that perhaps is simply grotesque); your landowners give rich benefices to their kinsfolk, or sell them, like their garden-stuff, in the public markets; fully half of all your

"livings" are "saleable," and may come, and sometimes do come, under the hammer; and your *Ecclesiastical Gazette* has often "edified" your pious Churchman by "advertising" hundreds of livings for sale at one time—1497 in one advertisement! To take only two more specimens of your ethics: Your *idle* clergy have been always splendidly paid, and your *industrious* clergy left to live on bread and water; or, to quote one of your own clergymen (who was "suspended" for his sentiments): "The industrious, the ingenious, and the imaginative starve, while bloated mediocrity pants with success." And next, your High Church bishops, who pretend to be so "Catholic,"—and who are so shocked by being supposed to be "Erastian,"—when they receive their spiritual mission from the Sovereign make the following (profoundly "Catholic") declaration: "I do confess to hold the Bishopric of ———, as well the spiritualities and temporalities thereof, only of your Majesty, and of the Imperial crown of your Majesty's realm." These examples may suffice to vindicate the accusation we bring against you, of being, ethically, as utterly unworthy of being "established" as you have been proved to be historically and doctrinally.

V.

We pass, now, from these arguments for disestablishment to the arguments which are in favor of establishment; such arguments as are urged by various parties, not necessarily either Anglican or Dissenting.

(1.) It is urged by these apologists, that the constitution of the Church—its political and quasi-national character—is "a safeguard against the encroachments of Romanism;" so that, if the Church were disestablished, Roman Catholicity would easily triumph over the multitudinous sects of English Protestantism. This pleading gathers force (in the estimate of those who urge it) from the fact that "sacerdotalism" would necessarily be advantaged by the removal of political influences from Anglicanism; and thus the Roman Catholic Church would have no strong foe to contend with in urging its "superior pretensions."

(2.) The Act of Settlement provides, that the king (or queen) shall not be professedly a Roman Catholic; but, to disestablish the Church would be to declare that the sovereign was no longer its supreme spiritual head, because Church and State would be separated. And this would endanger the national Protestantism.

(3.) The "ideal" of the Church is the national profession of belief; so that to denationalize the Church would aid democratic socialism, if, indeed, it did not prosper positive atheism. The whole freethinking element of the British population would glory in the humiliation of an institution which, whatever its faults,

is a bulwark against impiety—in the form, that is, of overt, blatant atheism.

(4.) There would be a narrowing or sectarianizing of the Church of England, by its subjection to Anglican Canon Law; whereas, the principle of Nationalism may be allowed to be enlarging, or, at least, to prevent one party getting the upper hand.

(5.) Disendowment (which would accompany disestablishment to some degree, which must be correlatively decided) would bear hardly on a large number of poor districts, which would be unable to adopt the voluntary principle. Conversely, disendowment would *not* benefit the poor, for the tithes would be collected into the exchequer, and thus the wealthier classes alone would be the gainers. At present, on the contrary, the payment of the tithe reverts to the poorer classes in most parishes; who moreover have nothing to pay for "ministrations."

(6.) The Cathedrals would have no lawful masters, and would probably lose their "ideal" as Church centres; for it is not unlikely that the question of their appropriation would be "fought over" by all Protestant parties. And even assuming that some newly constituted corporation should take the question of appropriation into their keeping, what wranglings, what unseemly squabbles, would be generated in the effort of each party to press its claims.

(7.) The State Church costs *nothing* to the nation. This is true, both because the nation is not taxed for it, and because the nation receives from it great benefits. But what would a Free Church cost the nation, if the nation cared enough about it to maintain it?

(8.) The *free gifts* of church members to the State-Church amount yearly to something like five millions; such gifts being expended on schools, church societies, charities, foreign missions, expenses of divine worship, and building or restoring of Anglican edifices. So that the active sympathy of Anglicans with their own communion, though it would not justify the experiment of voluntarism, at least shows that disestablishment is a hue-and-cry of party advocates, not a profoundly felt desire of English Christians.

(9.) Scandals or abuses affect no *principle*. Let it be admitted that if you take the total net yearly value of endowments (received by all the officers of the establishment) you find that each clergyman *would* receive, on the average, three pounds ten shillings a week; *would* receive it, that is, but for the glaring inequalities which unhappily deface the present system; still, such inequalities might be easily lessened—might be, indeed, quite obliterated. Recast, if you like, the whole establishment; make it a more equitable institution; ensure a sufficient salary to all clergymen by lopping the huge endowments of a few clergymen; and be as

radical as you like with the dignitaries, to the benefit of the hard-working curates. Go back even, if you will, to a primitive simplicity, to an apostolic poverty and asceticism, and thus test the vocations of the clergymen. [This suggestion, however, must be unpractical so long as the Anglican clergy get married.]

(10.) Finally, let it be advanced that disestablishment and disendowment are both, in a true sense, impossible, because the Church of England never has been established by the State, neither has it ever been endowed. [No State document exists on either point.] The Church's own members, individually, have bit by bit built the sanctuaries of the Church; so that the State has no "ownership" in church property; nor has it legal or moral right to even pretend to deal, authoritatively, with what is in reality trust property.

VI.

We have thus sketched a sort of impression of the general "talk" which falls on the ear all over England; for, in a huge subject, presenting a score of different aspects, it is rather the fragments of personal views which find expression, than a clear, commanding synopsis of "first principles." Indeed it may be asked, and without the least fear of levity, are there any first principles in the matter? Is it not rather from *want* of principles—from national decadence in (professed) religious earnestness—that some millions of Englishmen have come to look with indifference on the spoliation of (what is to them) a Mother Church? That a vast number of Englishmen are shocked at the spoliation is no set-off against the fact that a vaster number still regard the whole movement without dismay. Even Mr. Gladstone, who is quite a typical "good Anglican," professes himself stirred only by expediency. He contemplates, with a profound composure and serenity, what the Bishop of Carlisle calls "rank robbery." No man sees the "difficulties" more clearly than he does, but no man makes less of "first principles." And if this be the attitude of Mr. Gladstone—who reads the Lessons in Hawarden Church on Sunday morning—how can we expect that the Radicals, or even the Liberals, will be restrained by an extreme delicacy of conscience? The truth is that the reaction from High Churchism, *plus* the reaction from Catholicity [the reaction, that is from a once earnest disposition to study the claims of Catholic truth], have left Englishmen simply wearied with *all* polemics, and asking only not to be "bored about controversy." A leading Protestant journal said recently: "What has come over the national spirit? Places of worship are, as a rule, not half full; strife, worldliness, prayerlessness, indifference, are almost everywhere the prominent features of Church life. . . . Nonconformist churches are but little better. Wesleyans, Baptists, Presbyterians,

Congregationalists, all tell the same story." And this is probably a truthful picture of the national coldness, and of the *cause* of the national attitude towards disestablishment, in all the sects, as well as within the national Church, and in all the political and social phases of English life.

Cardinal Newman has written recently, in an article in the *Contemporary:* "The world must be reckoned a worse enemy to religion now than at any time since Christianity came into being—because the world is better educated and informed than it ever was before." And though it would not be true to say that antagonism to the Establishment is any proof of society being more worldly, it is perfectly true to say that antagonism to *all* authority, and to *all* institutions which seem to favor it, is that growing disposition which is inimical to "Church and State," because the State lends dogmatic force to the Church. It must be borne in mind that a Protestant and a Catholic take a totally different view of the whole subject. A Catholic, of course, regards the Anglican establishment as, from first to last, only a political "accident;" or as the result of certain regal immoralities which, at the time of the Reformation, "changed religion." A Protestant thinks that Protestantism is "all right"; and, thinking so, has no idea of the divine, infallible teaching which *ought* to control the State and society. With him, therefore, it is no question of the gross and patent absurdity of a temporal power teaching religion to a spiritual power [he does not believe in a teaching spiritual power], but only a question of the State giving its support to the institution which represents dogmatic Protestantism. Now, so long as the whole country believed in dogmatic Protestantism, there was sense in the union of Church and State; but now that half the country disbelieves in it, while a large minority have given their hearts to dogmatic Ritualism, "Church and State" is an offence to the unbelievers, and an impediment to the freedom of the Ritualists. We trace, therefore, in this anti-establishment aggression the development of two perfectly distinct evils: the one (which is the greater) national faithlessness; the other a sectarian aping of Catholicity. This last evil is so final as to heresy that we may dwell on it for a very few moments in connection with the divorce of Church and State.

All changes which have taken place in English Protestantism, since the time when Queen Elizabeth first nationalized it, have led up, naturally and necessarily, to this final Anglican fallacy: the assumption of Catholic privileges by Protestants. We say "have led up to it naturally and necessarily." All Protestantism having been "found wanting," both intellectually and spiritually, it was "necessary" to do one of two things: Protestants must either become Catholics or they must discover (a) Catholicity in Prot-

estantism. Hence Ritualism! Catholics see the hollowness of the subterfuge; but doubtless many Ritualists do not see it. Now, "Church and State," when the Church meant "No Popery," and when the State meant "We will see that you don't have it," was a convenient and perfectly reasonable alliance; but "Church and State," when the Church means, "We *like* Popery, though a Popery *minus* any Pope but ourselves;" and when the State means, "You shall *not* have your Popery, and we will prosecute you in our law courts if you adopt it," is an anomaly more distasteful even to the Ritualists than it is to the skeptics or the indifferentists. Hence the Anglican clergy who, in the old Protestant times, would have besought the State to protect them against Popery, are now divided into these two sects of apologists: they who say, "We are Catholic priests, and we do not want your interference, and won't have it;" and they who say, "We rather like your loaves and fishes; our only complaint is, you do not drive out those Ritualists." To either sect the *raison d'être* is insufficient. And when we add the mighty masses of indifferentists [skepticism infects one-half of the population], it is no marvel that the aggressiveness of the root-and-branch men is more powerful than the apologeticness of the pruning men.

To a Catholic, it would be a cause for deep regret, if the Church of England were to be obliterated out of the nation; because it has filled, and even still fills, an awful gap in the national mind—a gap which no other sect can fill. The Church of England has been a bulwark for three centuries against the oppressiveness of the worst forms of skepticism. It has done an immense deal of what may be called social good; conferring happiness or religious repose upon millions of the English poor, and also holding together the middle classes in fellowship. Moreover, the noblest advocates of the Christian religion, the most learned and grave apologists for the Christian faith, have been found in the ranks of the Anglican clergy —not in the ranks of Nonconformists; and, though, necessarily, their splendid works have been imperfect, it would be ungrateful to fail to acknowledge their vast merits. True, the days are gone, and gone forever, when the stiff-backed, old-fashioned Anglican clergy were the doctors of orthodoxy to the whole nation; but let it be asked: Who can take their place in time to come? The Dissenters cannot do it; the Ritualists are but grave comedians; there is no powerful Evangelical party in the kingdom; the Church of England, disestablished, would shrivel into an historic sect, honored solely for its grave past, its remembered names; it would not be, in future, a national monument to historic faith—a national protest against the wickedness of *no* religion: the severance of Church and State would be the destruction of the idea that the State ought

to profess, at least, Christianity. To the minds of the masses it would mean this. You cannot degrade a rich man to a poor estate, without implying that you do not care to honor that rich man; and, to disendow the National Church would certainly mean, "there are *better* uses,—nay, even, there are more *religious* uses,—for all ecclesiastical property than is the present Anglican use." And this would be to degrade the national religion. It is an instinct of the human mind to render homage; and when a "church" has no claim to infallibility, it must put forth, at least, credentials to respectability; so that, if the State say to the Church, "Now, go about your business; and, as to your properties, we will discuss their uses in our civil parliament," it is only a natural, human conclusion that the once-honored Fallible Church has been weighed in the balance, and found wanting.

Very briefly, to summarize what has been said:

(1.) Politically, disestablishment is of party-interest, and Radicalism loves to pull down Tory strongholds.

(2.) Financially, the splendid properties of the Church are a fine bait to offer Radical constituencies, who, knowing little, and caring little, about equity, are easily lured to "return" demagogues who promise spoil.

(3.) No clerical party desires disestablishment, unless it be some few extreme Ritualists; while the Anglican laity would dislike it, both on traditional and fiscal grounds, save only such laity as are really Freethinkers.

(4.) Dissenters abuse the establishment "all round," politically, doctrinally, and ethically; but this is probably more from a sense of being humiliated, than from an intellectual or a religious repugnance.

(5.) The "world"—that is, all who do not care for religion, yet who have a respect for all decorous institutions—rather favor than disfavor the Establishment, and they do so on such pleas as are suggested by common sense, with just a touch of (traditional) homage for propriety. They urge that the Establishment is a good bulwark against license; that a Protestant sovereign is a guarantee of national liberties; that revolution, when really urged by anti-Christianism, is baneful to the national dignity and repose; that disendowment would pecuniarily injure the poor, and not really benefit any class; that the cathedrals and the grander churches are splendid monuments of a Constitutionalism, of which no extreme party should make havoc; that a State Church probably costs less than a Free Church; that education benefits largely by the parish system; that existing scandals could be utterly removed by the Legislature, much more easily than a New Church could be constituted; and, finally, that neither disestablishment nor disendow-

ment is, practically, within the sphere of political power, because the Church "has taken three centuries to be built up," and it would be impossible to respect the rights of its living heirs.

In the presence of all such reasoning, our conclusion is that the Church of England will be "let alone" for many sessions—many parliaments; or that, though the pruning-knife may be used pretty freely, the axe will not be laid to the roots. Revolution is not characteristic of the English mind; it is the game of the charlatan, the demagogue. No change could be more profoundly revolutionary than the defacing or effacing of the National Church, which represents (to the English mind) not only religious stability, but the very foundations of Constitutionalism. In Ireland, there was simply the case of a Catholic country which was overridden by a Protestant hierarchy—a monstrous and a patent anomaly. In England, it is really a case of a national Ecclesiasticism (less a Church than an assertion of Church principles), which gives the freest possible scope to every variety of opinions which can be included within the idea, Christian Religion. This may be said to suit the English Protestant mind. It is perfectly true that the growth in the two extremes—Freethinking and Ritualistic Pretension—has altered the relations of Church and State, has affected both their prerogatives and their mutuality, has even created an antagonism in principle which did not exist fifty years ago. All the more reason why what is *left* of national protest against the sweeping infidelity of the age should be treasured with conservative ardor; since the more you give way, the more you will have to give way—equally in politics and in religion. This is, of course, the English conservative point of view. As Catholics, we might have a good deal to say; but we have rather pictured the English, national estimate. What we would *wish* for the English Religion is one thing; but, seeing what it is, we do not want the Herbert Spencers to do in the Church what the Bradlaughs are trying to do in the Parliament.

HOW IRELAND HAS KEPT THE FAITH SINCE CROMWELL'S TIME.

THE outburst of Puritan fanaticism which culminated in the despotism of Cromwell was only an episode in the history of English Protestantism. That system of belief is as essentially a political institution as was the old worship of pagan Rome. The politicians who established it cared little for religious truth, but much for political expediency, and political expediency had been their reason for changing the religious faith of the English people. A large section of the people had been unable to comprehend the motives of their rulers, and had carried their newly-made creed to lengths wholly beyond the designs of its makers. A generation of fanaticism had proved quite enough for the English people, and, on the death of Cromwell the former order of Church and State was restored in a torrent of popular enthusiasm. During a generation the term "fanatic" was an epithet of the deepest contumely in the English tongue. For in the latter part of the seventeenth century Cromwell and his assistants were regarded in England very much as Guiteau is now by the American people. The Puritan *règime* was denounced as a compound of dishonesty and cant, and the courtiers of Charles II. lost no opportunity of expressing their contemptuous hatred of the fallen Puritans. The Restoration of 1660, however, brought only a slight respite to the persecution of the Catholics in Ireland. The Government of Charles II. regarded a state religion as an important department of the administration, and the persistent refusal of the Irish Catholics to conform their creed to the orders of Parliament seemed to them little short of overt rebellion. The Cromwellian conquest had to a great extent identified English Protestantism with Puritanism in Ireland, and, as Puritans and Catholics were alike distasteful to their English rulers, some respite was naturally given to the latter there. A price was no longer set on the heads of priests, nor were the towns swept of their Catholic inhabitants, as under Cromwell, but, in other respects, the profession of the Catholic faith remained under the ban of the law. It might be connived at, but it could not be openly tolerated by the men who controlled the government. In many respects, the condition of the Church in Ireland under Charles II. resembled that of the German Catholics during the full rigor of the May laws, four years ago. The private belief of Catholics was but slightly troubled, but the organization of the Church was jealously forbidden. The rulers of England under the Restoration had little concern themselves about any system of religious

belief, but they looked on religion as a valuable political engine, the control of which they desired to retain in their own hands. Catholic bishops were especially distasteful, and, during the first eight years of Charles II., only one, the Bishop of Meath, was permitted to re-enter the country, and that privately, under the protection of powerful relatives. The whole Catholic population of three provinces, and of the more fertile portion of Connaught, had been stripped of all property in the land, and reduced to the deepest poverty. Schools and colleges had been all swept away, and their establishment was strictly forbidden, except under the direction of the Protestant clergy. It is needless to say that all public provision for the support of Catholic worship had disappeared, and that the churches throughout the land were in possession of the Protestant ministers, or in ruins. A formal abjuration of the Faith was a necessary condition for obtaining public office from the Crown, and might, at any time, be legally demanded of any one prominent in public affairs. Temporal rewards for formal apostasy were held out to the Catholic people of Ireland in the depths of the misery in which they had been plunged by confiscation, famine, and war. The Duke of Ormond, who had abandoned the creed of his parents, was among the foremost men of the Court, and was enriched by enormous grants of land and money, while Catholic families of equal rank were refused even an opportunity of proving their titles to their own property. The cultivators of the soil had the same temptation held out to them in a different way. Wherever Protestant tenants could be had, the fertile lands were assigned to them, while the Catholics were obliged to extract a precarious livelihood from the mountain sides and bogs. The traces of this system are visible to-day. Throughout Ulster, the rich valleys are almost invariably in the possession of Presbyterian or Episcopalian farmers whose ancestors were established in them over two centuries ago, with a specially favorable tenure, known until lately as the Ulster Tenant Right, while the mountains are almost as invariably peopled by Catholics, whose ancestors forfeited their lands rather than their Faith. The necessary condition for obtaining a share in the rich lands that had been handed over to foreign proprietors was apostasy, and that condition was steadily refused, though the scourge of famine came more than once to remind the Catholics what were the consequences of their refusal. In 1673 more than five hundred Catholics died of starvation in the single archdiocese of Armagh, and the archbishop, Dr. Plunket, wrote that he was only too glad to have enough of oaten bread to support life, and a thatched cabin to reside in. The poverty of the unfortunate population was aggravated by the extortions levied by the Protestant clergy. Fines were claimed for baptisms, marriages and funerals,

from the obdurate Papists, besides the regular tithes of their fields and flocks. When the victims attempted resistance, they were charged with non-attendance at the State worship, and crushed by arbitrary fines at the discretion of the local magistrates, or Protestant bishops who enjoyed judicial as well as clerical functions. When it is remembered that four generations have had to endure life under a system like this, and yet that Ireland is as Catholic to-day as two hundred years ago, we can appreciate the wisdom of the statesmen who have, in late years, undertaken to root out Catholic belief in Germany, Switzerland and France.

The maintenance of the Catholic Church in any country requires the existence not only of priests, but of the regularly organized hierarchy. In Ireland, under Charles II., the parochial clergy were but comparatively undisturbed, or only by such vexations as were common to them with the members of their flocks. The Government jealously prohibited, as a rule, the exercise of any episcopal functions, and hoped thus that the supply of priests would gradually fail, through the action of time and the stop of ordinations. In some dioceses confirmation was not administered during forty or fifty years, and others had been left entirely without bishops during an even longer period. The old Bishop of Kilmore, who alone had been able to baffle the pursuit of Cromwell's police, was utterly broken down in health, and, during the first eight years of the Restoration, Dr. Plunket, of Meath, was the only bishop capable of exercising functions in the whole island. In 1668 the Holy See appointed archbishops to the vacant sees of Dublin, Cashel and Tuam, and also a Bishop of Ossory ; but so jealous was the English Government of the arrival of Catholic bishops, that it was thought prudent to have them consecrated in private, and at a distance from Rome. They slipped into their diöceses, one by one, without attracting much attention, and quietly commenced the work of reorganizing the Irish Church. The following year, Oliver Plunket was consecrated Primate of Armagh, with closed doors, in a private chapel in Brussels, and, a few months later, he too, found his way back to Ireland. So reduced in resources were the Irish Catholics that the four archbishops, with as many bishops, were deemed an ample episcopate for the thirty-six dioceses of Ireland. Even that number could hardly be supported by the impoverished people. The revenues of the Primate never exceeded three hundred dollars a year, and he described himself as much wealthier than most of his brethren. The Bishop of Kildare's usual income was only seventy-five dollars, and not a single prelate except the Primate ventured to keep a house of his own. As a general rule they lived as visitors in the house of some relative or other member of their flock, and exercised their functions as best

they could in private houses, and often in the shade of the woods, or the caves of the mountains. At times, the protection of some friendly official or territorial magnate enabled them to appear with comparative freedom, and such precious moments were eagerly profited by to administer confirmation, or to ordain priests. Thus, on one occasion, the Protestant Bishop of Derry forbade any interference with the Catholic Primate in his diocese, and allowed him to confirm in public. A similar protection was afforded him by Lord Charlemont, and even the Viceroy Berkeley showed himself friendly to the Primate personally. The latter even ventured to hold a Synod at Dublin, in 1670, though, a few months previously orders had been issued for his arrest, in case he should be found in Ireland. But such instances of toleration were intermittent, and liable to be followed by outbursts of persecution. The Archbishop of Tuam was arrested, three or four years after his arrival in Ireland, on a charge of exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction contrary to law, and, after imprisonment, was sent into exile. In 1673, all the bishops had to hide, and the letters of Dr. Plunket give a vivid idea of their condition at this time. In company with the Archbishop of Cashel he found refuge in a thatched cabin in the mountains, where "they could see the stars through the roof, and were well refreshed by every rain." They were happy to have enough of oatmeal porridge and milk and oaten bread for their support, and had taken the precaution to carry some books and a supply of candles with them, to resume their studies in their retreat, until an affection of the eyes, brought on by exposure, left the Primate incapable of reading or writing. This outbreak of persecution lasted over a year, and only then could the archbishops venture back to their ordinary residences. Experiences of this kind were of common occurrence in the life of Irish ecclesiastics during the seventeenth century, and it is suggestive that they had no effect in thinning the number of candidates that still continued to offer themselves for the Mission. The Bishop of Meath ordained over two hundred and fifty priests to supply the vacancies made by the Cromwellian persecution, and in 1676 there were nearly three hundred secular priests in Ulster alone, apart from the friars and Jesuits.

It was not enough, however, that men should be found to face the risks of persecution to recruit the priesthood. A certain amount of school training is indispensably required as a preparation for the Catholic priesthood, and on no point has the policy of the English Government been more consistent in Ireland than in keeping control of the schools. From the days of Elizabeth it had been a special offence for any Catholic to give instruction in Ireland, either to his own coreligionists or to others, and the law was

strictly maintained under the restored monarchy of Charles. Primary schools at that time were unthought of, and Trinity College, an essentially Protestant corporation, had practical control of all higher education. A certain amount of such education, however, was a matter of necessity to the Irish Catholics if they were to preserve the Faith permanently, and hence the system of hedge schools arose which for several generations kept up, however rudely, the cause of free education in Ireland. During the seventeenth and the early part of the eighteenth centuries the great majority of the Irish secular priesthood received their education in the clandestine hedge schools. In a visitation of the diocese of Raphoe in 1677, it is so stated, that of fourteen priests only one had ever been outside his native diocese, and the report adds that "they had learned superficially grammar and poetry," *i.e.*, Latin, and, after the manner of the country, some cases of conscience." A knowledge of Latin, at least sufficient to read it, and enough of moral theology to solve the ordinary cases of conscience, were the course required for the Irish priesthood in the seventeenth century, and even that could only be attained with the greatest labor. It was not that the Catholics of the persecuted land were indifferent to knowledge, but that its pursuit was legally barred to them, and it was only by stealth that they could venture to hand down the elements of knowledge from generation to generation. In the recent work of a Russian Nihilist, Stepniak's "Russia under the Czars," the author gives what he regards as a fearful instance of governmental cruelty. He tells how a party of students had been deported to a remote frontier town, and kept under police surveillance while allowed personal freedom. To beguile the monotony they organized a class for mutual instruction, but after a while the suspicions of the chief of police were aroused, and he summarily forbade the continuance of the lectures. To the indignant Russian such inhumanity seemed too gross to be believed, and he quotes it as an instance of the barbarian nature of Russian despotism. The rule of the Russian police captain was, however, for nearly three hundred years the exact system publicly carried out by the English Government in Ireland.

The colleges for the education of Irish priests, which had been founded in different parts of Catholic Europe, must be reckoned among the means by which the Faith was kept alive during the long centuries of the Penal Laws. The number of priests they actually supplied, however, was a very small one. The Irish College at Rome, founded by Cardinal Ludovisi, maintained and educated eight students, those of Salamanca, Santiago, Lisbon, and Alcala about six or seven each, and that of Bordeaux something over twenty. These were the chief colleges from which the Irish

clergy could draw recruits; but the various religious orders, Jesuits, Franciscans, Dominicans, and Augustinians, had also numerous Irish students in their houses on the continent. The main body of the clergy had to be content with whatever instruction it could find at home, and some touching accounts remain of the efforts made by the persecuted people to secure for themselves a higher education. Dr. Plunket, the martyr Primate, retrenched his plain food and wore no cloth but frieze, for the purpose of supporting three Jesuits as teachers in the academy which he established in Drogheda in 1670, during a period of unusual toleration. One of the professors was employed in teaching theology, his pupils being all priests who had no previous opportunities of instruction beyond those afforded by the elementary Latin schools during the reign of Cromwell. The fact that in a single diocese no less than fifty ordained priests were thus enrolled as students, shows to what straits the Church had been brought in Ireland. The other professors taught the usual classic course to about two hundred boys, nearly a quarter being Protestants of good families. It was only with the utmost difficulty that the school could be supported, as the bulk of the pupils were incapable of contributing anything to the maintenance of their teachers. Even this modest establishment, however, was not suffered to exist beyond three years, when an edict of the Government suppressed it, and compelled the Primate himself to take refuge in the mountains of his diocese to escape arrest. A similar fate befell a Catholic school which had been set up near Dublin, and Catholics were even forbidden to reside in the latter city unless they had been already established there. The Government was fully resolved that if it could not Protestantize its Catholic subjects, at least it could make them ignorant of human learning, and during a long century this policy was rigorously carried out.

While prohibiting the exercise of Catholic worship, the Government of Charles neglected no opportunity of raising divisions among the Catholics. It is significant of the nature of the warfare against Catholicity that, while the Government professed to regard the doctrines of the Church with abhorrence, it was always ready to support any priest who might revolt against his superiors. In Derry a priest named O'Mulderig had been named Vicar Apostolic, but was subsequently deposed for various crimes. Though still professing himself a Catholic, he did not hesitate to call the Government to maintain him in his position as a Catholic prelate, and the required aid was at once given him by the arrest of the priest appointed to take his place. At the beginning of the reign of Charles, a Franciscan, Peter Walsh, who had adopted Jansenist views, attempted to make himself the representative of the whole

Irish Church, and under the protection of Ormond convened a meeting of the Catholic nobles at Dublin, when a declaration of faith was drawn up in language offensive to the Holy See. Though disowned by the bishops, Walsh gathered some adherents, who were at once taken under the patronage of the viceroy, much as the Old Catholics were taken up by Prince Bismarck a few years ago. The Valesians, as Walsh's adherents were styled, were allowed to open churches and convents, while the Catholics were debarred from any public exercise of their worship. The craft of the viceroy, however, was all in vain. The attempted schism died out, and Walsh himself made his submission after a few years. It even proved of benefit to the Church, for the chapels which had been opened for the expected schism were not interfered with afterwards; and thus their use was accorded unintentionally to the Catholics.

Judged by purely human reasons, the prospects of the Church in Ireland in the reign of Charles were well-nigh hopeless. The greater part of the land and nearly all political power had been taken away from the Catholics. A large and compact minority of English and Scotch settlers controlled the Government, and were supported by the whole power of England. The clergy were under the ban of the law, and the means of filling up the gaps in its ranks were cut off as far as the power of the Government could reach. The connivance of some years was interchanged for the violent persecution of others. In 1674 all the bishops but one had to fly to the woods, and six years later, when the Popish Plot frenzy seized the English people, its effect was felt in Ireland. The Archbishop of Dublin was confined for two years in a cell in Dublin Castle until death released him, and the Primate, Oliver Plunket, after twelve years of unceasing toils, was executed as a traitor at Tyburn on the evidence of some infamous characters. His blood was, indeed, the last actually shed for the Faith in Ireland, but for a whole century longer the fidelity of its people continued to be tried by the inflictions of the Penal Laws.

Dreary as was the lot of the Irish Catholics under Charles, yet drearier times were to come. The accession of a Catholic to the throne in the person of James II. brought a gleam of hope to the downtrodden nation; and when that unfortunate monarch was driven from England by the Dutch army and the treachery of his ministers, the vision of an independent Ireland seemed for a moment on the point of being realized. A representative Parliament of the whole nation, Catholics as well as others, held sway in Dublin. Full toleration for all was proclaimed in the Catholic Parliament of Ireland, as it had been half a century earlier in Catholic Maryland; and the independence of the Irish Parliament itself of all

English supremacy was declared at the same time. The work of reorganizing the nation was pushed on with activity, if not always with judgment, by the Viceroy Talbot, and the popular hopes were raised to the highest for the future of their country. But those bright hopes were short-lived. The hastily raised levies were overmatched by the veterans of William, fifty thousand of whom were sent to the conquest of Ireland, and after a gallant contest of two years the remnant of the Irish forces capitulated on honorable terms at Limerick. Their forces were still formidable, and as William was anxious to bring the contest to a speedy termination, so full toleration was accorded by solemn treaty to the Catholic population, and the army was offered its choice of entering the service of the conqueror or of following the fortunes of his dethroned predecessor. Fourteen thousand of the flower of the nation accepted the latter alternative, and sailed away from their native land forever. Scarcely had they departed when the terms of the treaty were broken, and the whole power of the Government once more was set to work to root out the Catholic Faith from the soil of Ireland.

The toleration promised by the Treaty of Limerick was refused by Parliament, and the Penal Code against all exercise of Catholic worship replaced on the Statute Book. All Catholic bishops, dignitaries and religious were ordered to depart the kingdom forthwith, and a few years later the same rule was applied to all priests whomsoever who had not been registered. A limited number were allowed to remain on condition of making their names and residences known to the authorities and taking the oath of allegiance, but it was expressly provided that this regulation should be only temporary, and that no successors should be allowed to take the place of the registered priests as they were removed by death or other causes from their parishes. As the presence of Catholic bishops in Ireland was utterly forbidden, no exercise of Church discipline was allowed, and any registered priest, if so disposed, might refuse to conform to any rule of his superiors with impunity. Their registration was, besides, no protection against the vexations of the magistracy. The latter might require them at any time to take an oath of abjuration of the Pope's temporal supremacy which, in the opinion of the Protestant judges, was not incompatible with the Catholic belief, but which was received in a very different light by the Catholics themselves. The registered parish priest of Macroom was thus committed to jail in 1712, and his case was not a solitary one. In the County Leitrim alone, about 1714, the grand jury found presentments against no less than thirty-one priests and two schoolmasters, but they mournfully added that not one could be captured in spite of the large rewards offered for each.

In Sligo and in Waterford, during the years 1712 and 1714, numbers of Catholics were compelled to swear where they had last heard mass and who had officiated, but the attempt to secure the persons of the hunted clergy was as unsuccessful as the presentments of the Leitrim grand jury. In other cases, however, the chase was more successful. In Cork, Fathers Hennessy and Carty were convicted of being priests and transported beyond the seas in the summer of 1712, and Father Boyle, in Galway, and Father Hamal, in Down, were arrested and held for trial the same year. Two Catholic teachers were also reported as being in Longford jail under conviction for "having been Popish schoolmasters." Two more were under sentence for the same crime in Dublin in 1715, and a curious letter bearing date of the beginning of 1713 is preserved in the Irish archives from the cousin of Secretary Dawson, a resident of Armagh, which sets forth that he had a few months before arrested Brian McGurk, the Popish Dean of that place, and had obtained witnesses against him, but that his prisoner died before the assizes, and he hoped that this mischance would not deprive him of the reward of fifty pounds which he would have been entitled to on conviction. Another letter states that Father McGurk was ninety years of age, bedridden and in second childhood at the time of his arrest, facts which must enhance our sympathy with Mr. Dawson's disappointment at his thus being cheated of his legal right. It is a striking fact to find the Protestant Primate Boulter reporting to the Irish House of Commons, in 1732, that there were over fourteen hundred secular priests and two hundred and fifty friars at that time in Ireland, and nine communities of nuns and five hundred and forty-nine Popish schools were maintained in full defiance of the law. The worthy Primate, an Englishman and a bitter fanatic after the manner of the times when fanaticism was little beyond a hatred of the Catholic Church, complained at the same time of the difficulty he found in obtaining eight hundred ministers for the State Church, in spite of the immense revenues and power at its disposal. Again, as in the old days of Rome, the persecutors had to confess their powerlessness before the passive resistance of Christian faith.

Though the priests were specially the object of pursuit, it must not be supposed that the simple Catholics were left unmolested in the practice of their religion. It was impossible to imprison or banish an entire nation, and the attempts to compel attendance at the State churches had proved utter failures; but still, there were ample means of making Irish Catholics feel the power of the law whose peculiar creed they so obstinately refused to profess. From all share in public affairs they were absolutely excluded. No Catholic could be a member of Parliament, or of any municipality; they

might not vote, nor sit on juries if objected to; the courts were closed to them, and their testimony might be refused on the grounds of their religion. Against personal outrages they had, practically, no legal redress, and the remnant of landed property, that a few still retained, was at the mercy of any Protestant claimant. The law provided that any member of a Catholic family might claim its property absolutely by becoming a member of the State church, thus offering a premium to the disregard of filial affection or subordination. The learned professions were closed to all who refused to swear to the royal supremacy, and Catholics were forbidden by statute from educating their children, either at home or abroad. The tenant-farmers, who had no lands to lose, were not beyond the reach of the Code, which combined the brutality of a Roman tyrant with the jealousy of an English huckster. Catholics might not take leases for over thirty-one years, and in case any farmer was able to extract from his holding anything above *one-third of the rent*, his right in it was declared forfeited, and any Protestant might oust him from its possession. The fact that any Protestant might take a horse belonging to a Catholic on payment of five pounds, has been widely commented on as an instance of the severity of the Penal Code, but it is not so generally known that the right to possess horses at all was one of the first relaxations of the Penal Code, by which arms and horses were alike forbidden property to any of the proscribed faith.

The trading and manufacturing classes fell equally under the restrictions of the Penal Code. Catholics were not allowed to invest money in real estate, or even to lend it on real estate security; they might not be received into many trades, and in all they were forbidden to receive apprentices beyond one or two each, and they might not own houses or even reside in many of the principal towns. Galway and Limerick were among the cities in which Catholics were forbidden to dwell, except under special conditions, and in Bandon, Enniskillen, and Belturbet, down to the middle of the century, no Catholic was allowed to live on any pretext. In Limerick it was found impossible to eject the whole population, but down to 1744 no Catholic chapel was allowed within its walls. In Galway, which had long been the second city of Ireland, the whole Catholic population was expelled in 1708, and again in 1715, with a few exceptions. The freedom of all corporations throughout the country was expressly reserved to the Protestant citizens, and the civic property was, in almost every instance, shamelessly jobbed away to members of the same creed. Among the Catholic Irish no class was too insignificant to escape legal persecution. The fishermen of Folkestone petitioned Parliament, in 1698, to redress the injury done to them "by the Irish catching herrings at Waterford

and Wexford and sending them to the Straits, thereby forestalling the petitioners' market;" and a few years later, the Protestant porters of Dublin solemnly laid before a sympathizing Parliament the grievous wrongs they suffered at the hands of one Darby Ryan, a papist merchant, who presumed to give employ to porters of his own creed.

The family relations among the poorest Catholics did not escape the malevolence of the law. The right of becoming guardians to minors was denied to all members of the proscribed faith; and in the case of Catholic minor heirs, the Chancellor at once seized their persons and had them brought up as Protestants. In this way the Duke of Ormond in the reign of Charles, the celebrated Earl of Inchiquin, and the Marquis of Antrim in the beginning of the eighteenth century, were removed from their families and forced into a profession of the State belief. It was impossible to apply such a rule to the children of the poor, universally, but the Government, during the whole of the century, made constant efforts to put it in practice partially. The poverty of the bulk of the population, resulting from their exclusion from all profitable employments, was described as a crime by the very legislation which forbade them from acquiring property. In Dublin, in 1703, a society was empowered to arrest all *idle vagrants*, *i. e.*, unemployed poor, found in the streets, and to keep them at hard labor in the workhouse prison for a term of seven years. All children over five years found begging might be at once seized and kept in the workhouse until their sixteenth year, after which they were to be bound out to any Protestant who wished to use their labor, for five years in the case of girls, and eight in that of boys. An act of 1715 extended the power of carrying off the children of the destitute Catholics to the minister and churchwardens of every parish throughout the country, provided the consent of a justice of the peace was obtained. A corporation, similar to the Dublin Institution, was established in Cork, in 1735, and it was enacted that the captive children should be interchanged between the two cities to separate them more effectually from their parents. The well-known Charter-schools, founded by the Protestant Primate Boulter, in 1732, were another effort in the same direction, though more in the shape of a bribe for the surrender of poor Catholic children than the other Acts. These, the only primary schools of the country, offered to feed and clothe any Catholic children between six and ten that their parents would give up, on condition that they should be reared Protestants. Once received, the children were not allowed to see their parents, or hold intercourse with any members of their families, and their withdrawal was prohibited by law. The charter-schools were maintained long after

the relaxation of the penal laws, by the public funds, and only were abandoned in 1825. The treatment of the unfortunate children within these, and the foundling hospitals in Cork and Dublin, was marked by a refinement of anti-Catholic brutality which cannot be paralleled, we believe, elsewhere in the history of mankind. Howard, the philanthropist, in 1788, declared that their state "was so deplorable as to disgrace Protestantism and to encourage Popery in Ireland." The children were employed in the fields for eight hours a day, at the earliest possible age, and the bulk of them were sickly, naked, and half-starved. Their masters, however, were careful to provide them with meat or broth, at least once a week, and Friday was the day chosen the better to wean them from Popish practices. The unfortunate children thus violently separated from family, friends, and every friendly association, often retained their adherence to the rules of the Church, and broth was forcibly poured down their throats as a means of reclaiming them from Popery. Among all the brutalities of the Penal Code we must confess that the treatment of these hapless infants appeals most forcibly to our sympathies, and excites the profoundest scorn for the ruffian agents of the persecuting State.

To properly appreciate the force of the law thus directed against the family relations, it must be remembered that the penal laws had succeeded in reducing the great bulk of the Irish Catholics to the lowest poverty. Famines were of periodical occurrence, and no provision whatever was made for the support of the Catholic poor at any time. The trade guilds and asylums were for Protestants exclusively, and for the same class alone were occasional relief measures voted by Parliament. For the Catholic poor there was no succor except the charity of those scarcely better off than themselves; and so, at every season of dearth, the ghastly scenes of the last great famine in 1848 were of common occurrence. Boulter himself, in 1727, declares that "thousands of families had quitted their habitations the year before to seek for bread, and many hundreds perished;" and Swift, in the same year, and in 1729, tells a similar story. The taxable families, in the County of Kerry alone, diminished from fourteen to nine thousand between 1733 and 1744. The famine of 1741 was equally severe with that of 1848, and a pamphlet of that time speaks of the dead as lying in numbers along the roads, and the living as feeding on docks and nettles. Whole villages were depeopled in the rich Golden Vale of Limerick by mere want, and a Protestant minister in Monaghan, Skelton, declared that whole thousands had perished in a single barony, and the dead had been eaten in the fields by dogs for want of people to bury them. It was in the midst of scenes such as these that the Charter Schools were founded to offer bread to the

starving Catholics in exchange for their children's souls. But even then, the appeal was made in vain; and at no time, even with the powers of the law for seizing children by force, did the inmates of these institutions rise to a total of two thousand among a Catholic population of millions.

That a system such as the Charter Schools should be described as a work of mercy, may seem incredible, but such was actually the title given to it by its founders, and the Parliament which so long maintained it. In their words, at least, it was simply a benevolent attempt to relieve the miseries of the poor, and the breaking up of family ties and the abuse of the hapless children themselves were only small details, in no way detracting from its general character. Even in our own days, the system has found a eulogist in the well-known English writer Froude, and one is puzzled to know whether the constant system of misrepresentation of all things Catholic which for two centuries has been almost a creed in English literature, really produces an inability to distinguish between truth and falsehood; or, whether the writer in question regards history as an unscrupulous lawyer does a case entrusted to his pleading. The trick of giving false names to acts of oppression is an old one in the annals of Irish misgovernment. The politicians who devised and carried out the Irish Penal Code, steadily styled themselves the maintainers of civil and religious liberty. The usurper who, in breach of his solemn faith, sanctioned its commencement, was universally styled the "pious, glorious, and immortal deliverer" of the Irish people, in the language of the dominant faction, and the bulk of the people were styled, in viceregal speeches and acts of Parliament, as the common enemy of the nation. Even the execution of the anti-Catholic laws was often given the name of repression of vulgar crime. During an outbreak of agrarian violence in Connaught, in 1713, eight priests were flung into Roscommon jail, not as Catholic priests, but as accomplices of the disturbers, though no evidence whatever was offered of their connection with their acts. Like the "suspects," of recent years, they were "hostages, not criminals," but the magistrates preferred to give them the latter name, as it made the bitterness of the law more bitter by its infamy. The pilgrimages of the country people to the ancient shrines, which no violence of persecution could prevent, were frequently described as "riotous assemblies," and broken up by armed force during the recital of their devotions. But perhaps the most grotesque instance of the systematic blackening of the characters of the victims of religious persecution is that given by a Tipperary Grand Jury in 1750. A Father Hely had attended the bedside of a dying Protestant to receive him into the Church. The act alone was a capital offence

under the Penal Code, and the priest naturally did not appear for trial, whereupon he was outlawed. The act charged was the attempted conversion of a Protestant, but with the scrupulous regard for truth characteristic of the warfare against Catholicity, he was "proclaimed in the usual form, as a Tory, robber, and rapparee, of the Popish religion, in arms and on his keeping."

Such was the nature of the war waged during almost a full century by the whole power of England against the existence of the Catholic Church in Ireland. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, an impoverished population of less than a million (eight hundred thousand was the estimate of Archbishop King in 1703) was pitted against the full power of the fast-growing British Empire, and, twenty-nine years after its close, the Empire had to confess its utter failure by the Emancipation Act. Indeed, by the laws of human affairs, it was inevitable that the Irish people, reduced to abject want, deprived of leaders, of political organization, of the means of education, and of all open communion with the Head of the Church, should cease to be Catholic in a couple of generations. Such was the view of a man like Swift, at the beginning of the penal laws, and such is the view of all who forget that the hand of God is mightier than the policy of man. In 1732, a rough census estimated the numbers of the Irish Catholics at one million three hundred thousand, and the Protestants at seven hundred thousand, but a century later the numbers were found to be six and a half millions to one and a half millions. Through the long agony of the penal laws less than five thousand Catholics were found to deny their faith, as the Convert-Roll in the Irish Record office attests. All through the same time, the reports of the Bishops of the Established Church bewail the falling away to "Popery" of their own adherents. "Instead of converting those that are adults," wrote Primate Boulter, in the full rigor of the perfected penal code, "we are daily losing several of our meaner people who go off to Popery;" and, in Galway, in 1747, Colonel Eyre complained that "of late years several old Protestants, and the children of such, had been perverted to the Popish religion by the indefatigable assiduity, diligence, and the uncontrolled access Popish ecclesiastics had to the town." When the Royal College of Maynooth was founded for Catholic education in 1795, the last descendant of the Protestant Archbishop Ussher was one of its professors.

The freebooters of Elizabeth, the Calvinist colonists of James, the fanatic soldiers of Cromwell, and the greedy adventurers of William, had each, in turn, come to root out the Catholic Faith in Ireland, and, in the workings of Providence, the progeny of each has gone to swell the ranks of its adherents.

It is now over three hundred years ago since the Government of England first decreed that the Catholic Church should have no existence in Ireland, and, during by much the greater part of that time all its power was bent to the object of its extirpation. Two generations after Elizabeth had passed to her account, the whole power of Puritan fanaticism was turned anew to the same end. The restored monarchy of the Stuarts continued the task and sent the head of the Irish Church to die as a felon at Tyburn. The Dutch usurper and his successors during an entire century labored at the same task by all the means which the perverse ingenuity of man could devise, backed by an unlimited power over the lives, property, and good name of all who dared oppose its will; yet their work has passed away already. A few thousands are now found to profess themselves of the Independent sect which ruled supreme under Cromwell. The Church of Elizabeth, of James, and of the Georges, has, in our own days, been swept away as a useless plant that cumbered the earth in vain, while the Faith preached to the wild Celtic clans by the exile Patrick, fourteen hundred years ago, while a Cæsar yet held sway in Rome, is still to-day the living faith of the Irish race. We cannot conclude better, perhaps, than in the lines of the Catholic poet:

"The Celtic Cross raise over me,
Let the ivy 'round it twine;
'Twill tell to the land that bore me
That the Ancient Faith was mine;
And though fallen and poor I found it,
All trampled, and low, and lone,
Yet my heart grew the closer around it,
Like the ivy around that stone."

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE VISITATION NUNS IN THE WEST.

THE growth of religious orders, in newly-settled countries, is naturally attended by hardship and adventure; and the experiences of the Order of the Visitation in this country are far from being an exception to the rule. Some of these experiences are more or less tragical, some are amusing, and nearly all are interesting, not only in themselves, but on account of the fortitude, patience, and tact with which they have been met by the Sisterhood. Yet the interest they excite, arising from the combination of small incidents rather than the isolation of great ones, does not in the main absorb or thrill; it may be likened, on the contrary, to the quiet charm of those tapestry figures which satisfy the eye without fixing the attention. If they do not lose even this mild interest in our hands, we shall be fortunate; for we propose to exemplify these experiences by sketching the rise of a single house of the Order, upon which, happily, its early adversities, like winds sweeping over some majestic palm, have had no other effect, on the whole, than to strengthen its foundations, and perfect its symmetry. But, first, a word of religious orders in general, and of the Order of the Visitation in particular.

A religious life may be broadly defined as living in obedience to God; and, subject to the supreme direction of the Church, the object of every religious order, active, contemplative, or mixed, is, primarily, to secure this obedience in its members, and, secondarily, to promote the welfare, spiritual and temporal, of others, although, in the contemplative orders the recognition of the latter aspect is relatively vague and faint. This secondary feature of the common object is realized in various modes—teaching, preaching, relieving the poor, nursing the sick, consoling the afflicted, raising the fallen, upholding the light of example—all of which have come down unchanged from the earlier orders; but, with respect to the primary feature, the later orders pursue a method different from that of the earlier, which consisted chiefly in the mortification of the body by long vigils, extreme fasts, and exposure to other physical sufferings more direct and acute. This method, not inadequate to the rude times in which it prevailed or the gross yet simple temptations at which it was pointed, gradually lost its adequacy with the growing refinement of men and the increasing complexity of their besetting temptations. Sooner or later, therefore, it was destined to undergo a change; and the change came with the Society of Jesus, which, under the inspiration of its sagacious founder, insti-

tuted a new method, consisting in the mortification of the will, rather than of the body, whereby the stream of conduct, so to speak, might be purified in its source—the very citadel of the soul possessed and manned against besieging temptations. And this method—suited to temptations the subtlest as well as the simplest, to constitutions the most delicate no less than the most robust, and equally to every stage and phase of advancing civilization—distinguishes more or less conspicuously all religious orders since founded. But perhaps it has never arrayed itself in a more amiable and captivating form than in the Order of the Visitation of our Lady the most glorious Virgin Mary, founded, in the dawn of the seventeenth century, by Francis de Sales and Jane Frances de Chantal, who breathed into it the sweet and lofty spirit that still animates it, and which makes it to-day, as two centuries ago, a star of purest lustre in the religious firmament.

The founders of this Order were both of high birth, Francis de Sales having been the eldest son of the Count of Sales, one of the principal nobles of Savoy, while Madam de Chantal, married at an early age to the Baron de Chantal, a nobleman of Burgundy, was the daughter of Benigne Fremyot, President of the Parliament of Dijon, and an illustrious member of one of the best families of the *noblesse de la robe;* and both also were endowed with singular gentleness of character, clearness of intellect, and strength of will, the works of Francis de Sales, whereof the "Introduction to a Devout Life" and the "Love of God" are the chief, sufficiently attesting his rare intellectual endowments, and the letters of Madame de Chantal, in freshness, vigor, and grace, rivalling those of Madame de Sévigné herself, who, by the way, was her granddaughter. The married life of Madame de Chantal, remarkably serene and happy, was suddenly terminated by the accidental death of her husband; and, in the shadow of her great bereavement, she not unnaturally turned, with redoubled zeal, to devotional exercises, of which, however, she had never been unmindful. During the third year of her widowhood, in the world yet not of it, and yearning ardently for a religious life, she first met Francis de Sales, then Bishop of Geneva, who became her spiritual director, and eventually, having satisfied himself of her vocation, unfolded to her the project, already matured in his mind, of establishing a congregation of the Visitation; which she at once joyfully welcomed, and, despite some formidable obstacles, successfully coöperated with him in founding, becoming herself the first superior of the first convent of the new Order. In due time both were canonized; and it may be said that the institution they founded, as it had mirrored the spirit of their lives, caught up and has steadily reflected the light they shed from the altars of the Church: in it they still live.

The Order of the Visitation, as befits its origin, fulfils the two-fold intention of religious orders in a way notably gentle and at the same time complete, blending harmoniously the rigors of monastic discipline with the charities and amenities of the highest refinement. The Order was especially designed to open a religious field to ladies whose delicate rearing and feeble constitutions unfitted them for the life of the more austere orders. As originally conceived by its founders, indeed, it resembled the Institute of the Oratory, the members not being cloistered, and taking the simple vows only, thereby retaining the liberty of returning to the world, if dispensed by their lawful superior; and in this form it was actually opened at Annécy in Savoy on the 6th of June, 1610. But, in compliance with the urgent representations of the Archbishop of Lyons, Francis de Sales yielded his original conception, and eight years later, accordingly, in virtue of a bull of Pope St. Pius V., the institute was erected into a regular monastic Order, with enclosure and under the solemn vows. It was thus finally planted in the strong subsoil of the Church; and seldom has a cloistered stem borne so fair a flower or rich a fruit. Nor has its growth been less noticeable than its fruitage. Before the death of Francis de Sales, the mother-house at Annécy had put forth branches in the principal cities of France; and, within fifty years after his death, the number of convents of the Order had increased to more than one hundred. They now, we need not say, flourish in all quarters of both hemispheres.

It was not till the beginning of the present century, however, that the Order of the Visitation was introduced into this country, the first foundation having been opened at that period in Georgetown, D. C., by Bishop Neale, then coadjutor to Archbishop Carroll, first Archbishop of Baltimore; though the foundation was not settled till 1816, when Bishop Neale had succeeded Archbishop Carroll; and, at his instance, supported by a statement of the facts, Pope Pius VII. formally admitted the young community to the rank and privileges of a religious house. The progress of the Visitation in the Old World had been comparatively easy sailing; but no sooner was the Order launched in the New World than difficulties arose, not so much from the roughness of the waters, to pursue the figure, as from their trackless expanse, with the lack of suitable vessels, experienced crews, and the requisite sailing directions. The house at Georgetown, to drop metaphor, was opened with only three Sisters, natives of Ireland, at whose head was Miss Alice Lalor, who subsequently became the first Superior. Miss Lalor, known in religion as Sister Teresa, was born at Tenakil, Mountrath, Queen's County, Ireland, and was first cousin to Mr.

Patrick Lalor, formerly Member of Parliament for Queen's County, in which post he was succeeded by his son, Mr. Richard Lalor, who now fills it. Neither she nor the good Bishop knew the rules of the Order; and their school was held in a little frame building near the house of some Poor Clares, who, coming to this country from France a few years before, had sought to establish a convent of their Order in Georgetown, and with whom the Sisters of the Visitation, by the advice of the Bishop, took up their temporary abode. Among the books, however, belonging to these Poor Clares, strange to say, was found a volume containing the rules and constitutions of the Visitation Order, which the Bishop straightway translated; and one difficulty of the community was mastered. In a few months, the Superior of the Poor Clares died, and the remaining members returned to France, when the Bishop, alert on behalf of his foundation, purchased their property, and the Visitation Sisters occupied their house as a convent, still using the little frame building as an academy; and one other difficulty was at least mitigated. They had now tolerable vessels, and full sailing directions; but their crew remained scant and inexperienced. To supply this deficiency, Bishop Neale applied to the Order in Europe for some of its trained members; but none came. Another matter of solicitude on the part of the new community was the proper costume of the Order, of which they were ignorant; and the Bishop, though for years he anxiously scrutinized every package of devotional objects sent to the American mission, could find no book or picture that enlightened them respecting this point, until at length, on taking out one day the contents of a large box, his eyes met a handsome lithograph of St. Jane de Chantal herself, and the point was cleared up; although the poor nuns, it is said, could afford, after all, to furnish only Mother Teresa with a habit in fulfilment of the rule. Of the simple vows they had made, that of poverty was, indeed, easily kept; necessity alone would have exacted its observance. From this condition they soon emerged, without, however, the protection of the founder, who did not live to witness the triumph of his cherished community.

Archbishop Neale died in 1817, less than a year after the Papal recognition of his foundation, which he committed, by one of his last official acts, to the charge of Father J. P. Clorivière, a descendant of an honored house of Brittany, a soldier decorated by his sovereign with the Order of St. Louis, and a priest of marked ability, varied accomplishments, and unswerving fidelity. Under his direction, and that of his successors, aided by lights in the Sisterhood, the Mother Convent of the Visitation in this country, entering on a career of prosperity unchecked, if not unshadowed, realized at last the ideal of its founder, the three Sisters sheltered

in the house of the Poor Clares multiplying into a populous and far-famed convent, and the humble school in the rude annex developing into one of the most complete and renowned seminaries in the land. The weak craft, with scant crew and no supplies, that we saw struggling out of port, if we may recur to the nautical figure, was in the course of the voyage transformed into a palatial ship, which, richly equipped and nobly served, now rides at anchor in the harbor of its destination.

It was not to the mother convent, however, that we referred in the opening of this article, but to one of the fairest and most vigorous of its offspring—the Visitation Convent of St. Louis. The St. Louis foundation was first planted at Kaskaskia, Illinois, a flourishing town before St. Louis could boast of a name, and once the capital of the State, as well as the centre of civilization in the West, but now, through a tragic succession of flood, earthquake, tornado, and pestilence, reduced to a hamlet, containing less than thirty families, and without sight or sound of commerce; a complexion, indeed, to which it had already come, though still trailing faint clouds of traditionary glory, when the founders of the new community arrived there fifty years ago. Kaskaskia, it should be premised, was in the diocese of Bishop Rosati, of St. Louis. The journey of the colony thither, it would seem, arose from a formal application by the Bishop, who, in his letters to the mother convent, had left the impression not only that accommodations had been provided at Kaskaskia for the Sisters, but that the parish priest had resolved on surrendering to their use his own dwelling, insomuch that, on the eve of their departure, the Rev. William Matthews, Spiritual Father of the Convent, said jocosely to Mother Agnes, the head of the adventurous band: "If you have turned the priest out of his house already, I do not know what you will do after your arrival in Kaskaskia." The event, we regret to say, turned the good Father's pleasantry into somewhat bitter irony. With no misgiving of the event, however, the Sisters of the foundation, on the 17th of April, 1833, set out from Georgetown for the seat of their mission. We subjoin their names: Mother M. Agnes Brent, Superior; Sister M. Genevieve King, Assistant and Mistress of Novices; Sister M. Gonzaga Jones, Procuratrix, Dispenser, etc.; Sister M. Ambrosia Cooper, Sister M. Helen Flannigan, Directress of the School; Sister M. Isabella King, Teacher, Sacristan, Robier, etc.; Sister M. Josephine Barber, Postulant; Sister M. Catharine Rose Murray, Lay Sister, Cook, etc.

The Sisters travelled under the protection of the brother-in-law of Sister Genevieve King, Mr. Richard Queen, who in his marriage to Miss King, we may be pardoned for saying, showed that fate, like Shakespeare, is not above questionable punning. On reaching Balti-

more, they had the honor of dining with Archbishop Whitfield, and, after viewing his grounds, and visiting the Cathedral, Seminary, and other places of interest, drove to the Carmelite Sisters, who were in the act of celebrating the golden jubilee of one of their number, and by whom they were welcomed heartily and detained till the afternoon of the following day, when they resumed their journey, going from Baltimore to Frederick by horse-cars, which they saw then for the first time. At Frederick they were met by Father Virgil Barber, of the Society of Jesus, father of their postulant, and were introduced to Father McElroy, who died in the summer of 1877, aged ninety-five. The day afterwards, exchanging horse-cars for four-horse coaches, they began the ascent of the Alleghenies, which they crossed in four or five days; and, taking a steamboat at Wheeling, arrived in Louisville on the last day of the week, in time to go to confession to the saintly Bishop Flaget. The next morning they assisted at high mass in the Cathedral, and in the afternoon at Benediction, renewing their journey the following day, being accompanied through the locks of the Louisville and Portland Canal by Bishop Flaget, Mother Catherine, of the white cap Sisters of Charity, and Father Abel, the last of whom gave them a very doleful description of Kaskaskia, telling them they would "all die of pleurisy the first winter," which, adds the accomplished historiographer of the convent, "was not very far from the truth."

On the succeeding Friday, May 3d, being the anniversary of the Finding of the Holy Cross, the wayfaring Sisters reached the point at which they were to leave the Mississippi, the captain rousing them from their berths at three oclock in the morning, and explaining that, as there were no means of accommodation or conveyance on the Illinois shore, he would put them out at St. Mary's landing, on the Missouri side; which ere long he did. Near the landing stood the residence of a Mrs. Davis, which they had been told was a tavern, and whither accordingly they bent their steps, Mr. Queen, with a freedom proper to the guest of an inn, proceeding forthwith to order breakfast for the party, which was duly served; though while at table their hostess, with becoming delicacy, let it be known that her house in fact was a private one, upon which Mr. Queen, finding his foot in the snare that Tony Lumpkin sets for Young Marlow in the play, extricated himself by a fitting apology, wherein the Sisters eagerly joined. The drama of their Western life thus opened with a comedy act. After breakfast Mr. Queen, constituting himself a committee of one to examine the prospect, crossed the broad Mississippi, and made his way to Kaskaskia, two or three miles distant; whence he returned after dinner, reporting that the arrival of the Sisters was unexpected by everybody, not excepting the parish priest, whose house actually was so dilapidated

as to be scarce habitable by himself, and that no accommodations had been provided for them, although conveyances, he said, were on the way to carry them to the town, which he described, with open contempt, as "a little, miserable, out-of-the-way place." On receiving this report, so contrary to what they had been led to expect, the Sisters were disheartened, and would have returned to Georgetown had it not been for Mother Agnes and Sister Gonzaga, who remained steadfast, though disappointed as keenly as the rest. In the course of the afternoon, rallying a little from their dejection, they went aboard a flatboat, and, seating themselves on their baggage, were ferried across the Mississippi, their feelings on the passage being divided between fright at the sinking of the heavily-laden boat almost to the water's edge (Sisters Helen, Isabella, Ambrosia, and Rose sitting speechless throughout), and astonishment at the caterpillars overspreading the river far and near, so that the boat had to plow its way through to the Illinois side, where, with increased astonishment, they saw the same insect carpeting the shore and clothing the trees. Here they found awaiting them three vehicles, in size and shape like the old-fashioned milk-wagon, but known as the Kaskaskia stage-coaches, with the parish priest, Father Condamine (their future confessor), in the foreground on horseback, under whose escort they were soon on the way to Kaskaskia, all straining their eyes to catch a distant view of the place, when anon, to their amazement, they were told they were in it, although it proved as impossible to catch a near view of it as a distant one. Look as they might, they failed to see the town; not, like Yankee Doodle, for the houses, but for lack of them. Thinking to localize it by deduction, they inquired for the church, and were pointed to a log structure, which they had taken, and insisted on taking, for a barn, telling their informant he must be at fault or jesting, and were still on the lookout for the town, when their coaches stopped in front of the stone mansion of Mr. Wm. Morrison, grandfather, by the bye, of the Mr. William Morrison now in Congress from Illinois, and official leader of the House of Representatives.

Wm. Morrison and Pierre Menard, both of whom figure prominently in the history of the Sisters at Kaskaskia, were the leading citizens of the town, and among the leading citizens of the State. Col. Menard, however, though of the town was not in it, his residence being on the opposite bank of the Kaskaskia or Okaw river. Mr. Morrison's house, memorable as the scene of Lafayette's reception in Kaskaskia a few years before, was the only real edifice in the place, the other houses being rude fabrics of clapboards or logs, chiefly of one story, and hidden from sight by forest trees, the whole disposed irregularly on either side of a single street, whose Sab-

bath quiet the sound of wheels scarce ever disturbed. Other streets there had been, when the town was populous and prosperous, but now these were only indicated by fences, while, in place of the houses that once lined them, lay gardens or pasture-fields. Of Kaskaskia even then it might be said, as Goldsmith sang of Sweet Auburn,

> "No busy steps the grass-grown footway tread,
> But all the bloomy flush of life is fled."

Yet the inhabitants, it should be added, although sparse, were for the most part select and well-educated, so that the Sisters, at least, could enjoy the favor which Milton implores of Urania,—"fit audience find, though few." Mrs. William Morrison and her sister-in-law, Mrs. Robert Morrison, the latter a convert, and a woman of unusual intelligence, received Mother Agnes and her companions with great cordiality; and Mr. Morrison, on learning the object of their mission, offered them hospitality until accommodations elsewhere could be provided for them, setting apart for their use the entire second story of his house, including a capacious ball-room, which, however, had been rendered slightly unsafe by an earthquake that left a fissure in the wall, though the Sisters used to walk there to recite their offices and other forms of devotion. Another vestige of the same earthquake was observable in the wavy lines of the parlor floor, into which it had been shaken out of its original plane. The next day, the gentle newcomers were visited by the *élite* of the village, and among others by Lawyer Baker, who, as they afterwards learned, was generally chosen by the townsfolk to test the qualifications of those presenting themselves as teachers in the place, and who, in this character, really not ostensibly, had a long interview with Sister Helen, the directress of the school, resulting in his thorough satisfaction, followed by a favorable report of her education and acquirements, although, had she known his object, her embarrassment might have occasioned a less effective display of both. This informal examiner, we should say in passing, was none other than he whose eventful and brilliant career, in the senate and the field, terminated more than a quarter of a century later on the bloody heights of Ball's Bluff. The following day, being Sunday, the Sisters went to high mass, passing to and from the church through Mr. Morrison's large and beautiful garden, which adjoined the Catholic graveyard at the back of the church, so that they could go to mass or visit the Blessed Sacrament without entering the street. Father Condamine, who preached in French, suitably referred to their presence in Kaskaskia, explaining the purpose of their coming, and enlarging on the benefit that would accrue to the children of the congregation from Catholic

training and instruction. Bishop Rosati, on whom perhaps more properly devolved this good office, was detained at St. Louis by the prevalence of the cholera, during which he thought fit not to leave the plague-stricken city, lest his absence should be imputed to a wrong motive. But the Sisters suffered no detriment from this manly sacrifice to duty. The good impression they had made on all they met soon spread to the community at large, and they felt themselves, socially speaking, in a friendly atmosphere. But evidently their fortitude and resources were not to be lightly taxed.

On Monday, they began to prepare their own house,—a store lent them free of rent by Colonel Pierre Menard, who had the counters and shelves taken down, intending to change it into convent shape, with conventual entrance and grate. Meantime, the carpenter made their altar and tabernacle, which they lined and trimmed handsomely. Having been told in Georgetown that they would not need a separate altar, they came entirely unprovided; but, in the course of a week, they got everything ready, and were able to move into their house, where mass was celebrated the second Sunday after their arrival. They also had Benediction in the afternoon, and the Sisters sang, Mrs. Robert Morrison and some other ladies being present and enchanted with the music; "for," as the historiographer fondly explains, "our Sisters had very fine voices, and sang in two or three parts." Father Condamine gave the Sisters mass four times a week, saying on Sundays two masses, one for them and one for the congregation. He also lent them a few vestments until they could obtain a supply. Donations of all kinds were now pouring in,—provisions, beds, blankets, culinary utensils, etc., not to mention a chair apiece, which, till benches could be made, they carried up and down, from the choir to the refectory, and thence to the assembly. The town could not boast of a market, although it had a butcher, without much custom, however, as nearly every family raised and killed its own beef and mutton, sharing any overplus with some one or two neighbors, who, in due course, reciprocated the favor. The Sisters, until settled, were well supplied by Mrs. William and Mrs. Robert Morrison, who lived just opposite, and constantly ministered to their comfort in a thousand ways, even sending them nearly every morning hot waffles or cakes for breakfast. The negro men and women of Mr. William Morrison and his brother Robert, then and thereafter, were always at the service of the Sisters when needed, making their academy fires in the winter, scrubbing, cutting and hauling wood, filling their canoe (the cistern or rain-barrel of the country) with water from the Kaskaskia River, whenever the clouds failed, and in general doing whatever there was occasion for. During the first winter, the Sisters bought no wood at all. The Morrisons

not only supplied the infant community with wood, but sent their negroes to cut it. Not a day passed that Mr. William Morrison did not go to the house of the Sisters, and walk around the premises, to see if anything was wanting. He gave them, at first, one cow, then two cows more, a sheep, hogs, chickens; and, doing nothing by halves, added the corn and hay to feed them. He also gave the Sisters a large stove for the children's refectory, and a comfortable Franklin, and, for their library, presented them with Lingard's "England," in six or eight volumes, the "British Poets," in twenty-four volumes, the "Old and New Testament," in some thirty volumes, and several other works; and, besides all this, made them a present of a piano and guitar, a number of nice desks, tables, and washstands, and about a dozen pairs of shoes. Colonel Menard was not less generous. Keeping in his employ a carpenter and a weaver, he had the former construct each of the Sisters a bedstead, with tester, and a table, and the latter make them sixteen pairs of woollen stockings, and as many pairs of cotton, two pairs of each apiece. He also gave their sacristry a fine resting-stand, and often brought them himself a basket of squabs, and, most important aid of all, attended to their business, in person or by agent, as to his own, and, when needed, became their financial backer.

The first contribution of this free-hearted patron, however, soon came to be of no avail, the store he had lent them gratis, and from which, for their sake, he had removed all the mercantile conveniences, proving too small for their purpose. They had, consequently, to look out for other quarters, which they shortly found in the old Kaskaskia Hotel, then standing vacant and open, with many of the window-lights out, the sashes decayed, and ruin showing its face nearly everywhere; yet, all things considered, promising better than any other building in their reach, and offered to them, moreover, as the store had been granted, free of rent. They moved into it about the 1st of June, having spent one week at Mr. Morrison's, and nigh three weeks in the quarters just vacated. Their first task was to repair and adapt the old hostel, in front of which the weatherbeaten sign-board, in its rickety frame, still swung and squeaked, as if bemoaning the happy days that were no more. This grim *laudator temporis acti* the Sisters had cut down at the outset. They next covered the lower frames of the mouldering windows, constrained thereto by want of means, with blind windows of solid wood, fastened by bolts or buttons, and removable at will; substituting, furthermore, blind panes for the missing lights in the upper frames, as they afterwards did for the lights knocked out by a hailstorm. Then, having snugly housed in the livery-stable their cows, hogs, and poultry, they converted the ball-room into a chapel, the piazza into a parlor, and the bar-room—its

counter and balustrade demolished—into a children's refectory, play-room, and class-room: when their first task, comprehending of course numerous details not mentioned here, was accomplished. Later in the summer, we should not omit to say, they turned the loft of the livery-stable into a carpenter's shop, for the use of a workman sent them by the Lazarists at the neighboring town of Perryville, who, in addition to their great spiritual assistance, contributed in this way to furnish the new house with desks, benches, tables, cupboards, and the like conveniences.

At length, the Sisters, by their own perseverance and the kindness of their western friends, found themselves installed in a building fairly commodious as well as fairly comfortable, and were in fair working order, much to the gratification of the good people of the town, and especially of the Morrisons and Menards, who immediately placed their daughters at the convent school. As Mr. William Morrison had four daughters, and Col. Menard, besides an only daughter, had a bevy of granddaughters and nieces whom he educated, and as these young ladies took nearly all the extras, their enrolment as pupils gave the new seminary a cheering start. In reality, it could not have started, nor could the Sisters have remained in Kaskaskia at all, but for the Morrisons and Menards, who followed up their own patronage by soliciting that of their friends in St. Louis and other places, with such effect that the Sisters, in a short time, had as many pupils as they could teach. Col. Menard's daughter wishing to take lessons on the harp, as well as the piano, and the Sisters having no harp, he purchased his daughter one, which he allowed the Sisters to use in the school, and finally gave them, completing the necessary variety of their collection. Veritable curiosities to the townsfolk were these instruments, particularly the piano, which no doubt had its share in spreading the interest felt in the nascent community; for when the Sisters came to Kaskaskia there was no piano in the place, and one had never been seen by many of the inhabitants, including the daughters of Mr. Morrison, save the eldest one, the consequence being that the convent piano quickly set the town agog, men, women, and children flocking to see and hear it, almost as if it were the magical pipe of the Pied Piper of Hamelin. The musical accomplishments of the Sisters, in truth, had no little to do with their early success in Kaskaskia, neither culture nor the appreciation of culture being necessary to the charms of music, which captivate even "the savage breast;" so that their foundation, like a temple more renowned, but the reverse of holy, may be said to have risen

"with the sound
Of dulcet symphonies and voices sweet,"

though not assuredly "like an exhalation." In time, the Sisters organized a choir, whose services, by request, they put at the disposal of the parish church for Christmas and Easter, their best piano (for they now had more than one) being conveyed through the town to serve instead of an organ, the melodeon in its present form not having been invented at that time. Miss Sophie Menard played on these occasions, and the youthful choir sang their best in several parts, to the great satisfaction of the congregation, as well as of Father Condamine, justifying the compliment of "Aunt Hagar," an ancient negress in the service of the convent, who, when asked if there had been high mass at the church, said, "Not only high mass, but *very* high mass." This old woman, I ought to mention, at first a Methodist, and very prejudiced, became a fervent convert, and literally gave herself to the community, telling all who made inquiries that she had "jined the Sisters." She lived to be over a hundred, a pattern of every virtue, and dying, as she had lived, most holily. During the summer Mrs. Robert Morrison, who, although she had been a Catholic for a year or two, had not been baptized in the Church, holding her Protestant baptism valid, experienced a change of mind on this point, under circumstances deemed miraculous by those cognizant of them, and received Catholic baptism, as did her husband soon afterwards, and many others, acquainted likewise with her extraordinary experience. Mr. William Morrison's wife and children, it may as well be stated here, all became Catholics, and he himself was baptized on his death-bed about four years later. The presence of the Visitation nuns in Kaskaskia seemed the signal for a revival of Christianity as well as of education.

Meanwhile, the number of boarders no less than of day-scholars had increased so rapidly that the Sisters were again crowded for room, and had to look about for supplementary accommodations, which offered themselves in an unoccupied house, owned by a Mr. Mather, at the far corner of the same square, and which they rented for fifty dollars a year. It was a dismal-looking place; but convenient for their purpose. They took possession of it in the fall; and, as it was some two hundred feet distant from the Old Hotel, and they were compelled to cross the square many times a day regardless of weather, Mr. Wm. Morrison, solicitous for their health, made between the two houses a double pathway of long thick logs, whereon they could pass to and fro dry-shod, and, whenever it was fine overhead, walk two abreast for exercise and recreation. Mather's house now became the convent, while the hotel formed the academy, and the ball-room, lately the chapel, was converted to a use more in keeping with its original one, becoming the children's play-room, class-room, study-hall, and danc-

ing-room. The change was convenient in every respect, though it did not relieve the sisters from the exercise of their abundant ingenuity in transformation. The new chapel in Mather's house adjoined the choir on one side and the children's apartment on another, the altar standing exactly opposite the choir door, which thrown open gave the Sisters a full view of the sanctuary, visible also from the children's apartment. The choir, during the summer, was used for prayer exclusively; but in the winter the Sisters had to make it their assembly-room, novitiate, confessional, and chapter-room. Here they kept a piano, which served for Benediction and for music lessons. In this room, too, the priest took his breakfast. Under the chapel and choir were very good cellars, which the Sisters used for the children's wardrobe, and next the chapel stood a large turkey-house, roughly weather-boarded, which in summer they turned to account as a refectory, abandoning it in winter, however, to the icy blasts. Among the trials of these high-souled and devoted women, indeed, not the least was the intense cold of winter in this region. And now winter was upon them.

In Mather's house they took their first Christmas dinner, to which they invited Madam Menard, and in compliment to her dispensed with silence. In common with her hosts, she keenly enjoyed the entertainment, and, like them, was only amused at the snow drizzling through the roof over the table, and, despite a high fire in the fire-place, forming here and there tiny piles. The innocent hilarity of the company was brightened rather than dashed by these playful sallies of Old Winter. All the same, however, they shortly afterwards had the roof repaired. A few days later, as if fate were in a mood for sporting with them, the refectorian, having brought over the dinner and set it before the fire to keep warm while she went back to the kitchen at the hotel for something else, saw on returning a large dog, with a piece of meat in his mouth, come out of the refectory door, ajar from congenital defect, and sheer off with their dinner, a mishap which left them to dine that day on bread and molasses. But none knew better than they how to make the best of worse hardships than this. Their equanimity seems to have been proof against every physical trial. Not bread frozen as hard as a stone, and cut with hatchets instead of knives, could subdue their invincible good humor; for by that crucial hardship it was not unfrequently assailed. Cleanliness, John Wesley said, is next to godliness; but we doubt if cheerfulness does not stand betwixt them.

Mather's house, as we have said, was now the convent proper, and here the community lived, lodged, and had its conventual exercises, enjoying great quiet and retirement—virtual cloister life; for, the parlors being in the academy, the world scarce intruded. Yet it is

with the world very much as Horace says of nature: you may put it out at the door, but it will steal back through the chinks and crannies. Certain it is that in the course of the winter the convent became the scene of a species of manifestations which have cut a considerable figure in the world. Strange noises were heard, especially in the night: firing of pistols, moving of furniture, heavy steps as of men ascending the stairs. One night a loud rap came on the mantel near Sister Isabella's bed, and at the same moment the light was blown out. Three or four Sisters slept in that apartment, and all heard the rap, and saw the light extinguished. "Even in the daytime we heard these noises," says Sister Josephine, the convent historiographer, then a young novice, and noted always for her fearlessness. "Once I was going upstairs, when the *Invisible*, in heavy silk-robes, rustled close by me, and passed down. I turned my head, and gazed after the *passer-by* with all my might; but nothing but the sound of the rustling silk was discernible. The foot-fall was noiseless; and, though the robe seemed so close as to touch me, I felt and saw nothing." One evening during Compline the Sisters heard a heavy cannon-ball roll across the floor overhead, and then thump heavily down three steps. They raised their eyes, and exchanged glances, and Mother Agnes, looking at the Sister Infirmarian, signed to her to go up, for a sick Sister was in bed there. The Infirmarian found her patient trembling with fright. "Every night," Sister Josephine continues, "I used to hear a kind of clicking, an indescribable sound, something like the short chirp made by the turkey-hen. It seemed to be very near my pillow; and occasionally something seemed to strike my pillow, like a heavy drop of water falling on it. I mentioned this in recreation, and Mother Agnes and the Sisters told me to speak, and ask, 'In the name of God, who are you? and what do you want?' Night came, and with it my preternatural visitant, whom in a loud voice I interrogated according to orders; but, receiving no answer, said, as Mother Agnes had told me, 'In the name of God, depart!' It gave one click, and I heard no more of it that night. The next day, in recreation, the Sisters were joking over what had passed. They had heard me speak in the night, and, supposing I was holding colloquy with the ghost, lay still as mice in their beds, fearing to stir. But on being informed that, although obedient to the word 'Depart!' the nocturnal visitant had not deigned to disclose the purport of his visit, they told me I had spoken too loud. 'You must speak in a whisper,' said they. Next night I spoke in whispers, but with as little success. Yet when I whispered, 'In the name of God, depart!' one click came, and there was no more of it. Every night my ghost came, and stood at my pillow as long as I chose to let him, ten, twenty, forty minutes, more or less, but instantly and invari-

ably obeyed at the words, 'In the name of God, depart!' I do not know whether our Sisters sleeping in the same and adjoining rooms made use of any such adjuration; but I know their health seemed seriously threatened from the consequences of fear and loss of sleep." Father Timon (afterwards Visitor of the Lazarists and Bishop of Buffalo), who resided hard by at a place called "The Barrens," used frequently to stop at the convent, in pursuance of his duty as extraordinary confessor, and to see that all was well. On the occasion of one of his calls Sister Josephine told him of these strange "voices of the night," which he at first treated lightly, saying it might be owing to the state of her blood. "But, Father," she said, "I am not at all afraid." "Even so," he replied, "it may be attributable to some physical, natural cause." She assured him that Mother Agnes and all the Sisters heard the sounds, and that all, except Mother Agnes and herself, were harassed with fear and want of rest. Then Father Timon, cutting the gordian knot, said: "My child, it is a good sign. If the devil got what he wanted, inwardly, he would not have recourse to such outward disturbance." The next morning Father Timon said mass—for they did not have mass daily, as there was only one priest in Kaskaskia—and took Holy Communion to the sick Sister who slept in one of the haunted chambers. "From that time forth," Sister Josephine concludes, "we never heard any noise in the house." We have taken the liberty to cite *verbatim* a part of Sister Josephine's testimony, not merely on account of the vivid force with which she gives it, but to authenticate the experiences for the sake of those, embracing at present representatives of all grades of intellect, who indulge in speculations concerning the cause of such phenomena. For the rest, it must be said that no seclusion, not the holiest or most inviolable, can avail to shut out the devil, or his senior partner in the triple firm named by the Litany. Paradise did not. Nor did Heaven itself. So our Sisters, although the world forgetting, were not by the world forgot; but it must be owned they came off very well. Other experiences not less remarkable and more edifying, we may say, marked the history of the community at Kaskaskia; but the relation of these does not fall within the scope of this paper.

About two years had now passed since the arrival of the Sisters in Kaskaskia; and their foundation, no longer an experiment, bid fair to stand. In view of the palmy future that seemed opening before them, they resolved to erect a building of their own; to which end Mother Agnes conferred with Bishop Rosati during one of his visits, who, accompanied by some others, went with her to see the proposed site, and, it appearing eligible, the ground was purchased, Col. P. Menard advancing the money. The next step was more difficult. The building was to be of brick; but neither

bricks nor bricklayers were to be found in Kaskaskia. In this strait the Sisters wrote to Mr. Wheeler, of Baltimore, son of the architect who built the convent in Georgetown in 1831, and he, in response to their appeal, went out west, and took charge of their enterprise. In conjunction with Col. Menard, he at once set up a brick-yard in Kaskaskia, solely to supply bricks for the building in hand, there being no other demand for them in the place, and two years or so elapsing, in point of fact, before the second kiln was burnt. For the work, owing to the scarcity of workmen, went on slowly, and often, owing to their absence altogether, came to a stand-still, in such wise that when Mother Agnes resigned her office in May, 1836, nearly a year after ground was broken, little more than the foundations had been laid. Under these circumstances, Mr. Wheeler, himself a carpenter, proposed to erect a frame building, at right angles to the foundations of brick, and on a line with their east end, his view being that the frame building, which, anyhow, would be needed as a convent, might be put up expeditiously, seeing that he could assist in the work on this structure, as well as overlook that on the other, and have the former, he assured them, ready for occupancy before the next autumn. This assurance he made good; and in the summer vacation of 1837, about the last of August, they bade good-bye to the old hotel and to Mather's house, and removed to their new habitation.

Sister Helen Flannigan was now the Superior. Up to this time the community had lost none of its original members, and the previous year had received from Georgetown an important accession in Sister Augustine Barber, Sister Josephine's mother, who brought with her a lay postulant with whom she had become acquainted in Cincinnati, and was followed a few months later by two other postulants from the same city. In Kaskaskia there seemed no such thing as a religious vocation. Of the ten Sisters professed in the eleven years at Kaskaskia, not one was a native or denizen of the place; nor was one of the postulants.

The house of which the Sisters now took possession was two stories high, one hundred and forty-two feet by twenty, and, with its fresh paint, green blinds, and piazzas fore and aft, "looked," Sister Josephine says, "like a long steamboat," a comparison that may or may not imply disparagement, for in those days, to a western eye, a steamboat was the flower of architectural beauty. At all events, the building was their own. But hardly had they got into it when the death of a postulant occurred, followed by the death of Sister Ambrosia Cooper, October 2d, and that of Sister Gonzaga Jones, December 3d. The sadness occasioned by these afflictions was not lightened by the absence at that time of a stationary pastor in Kaskaskia, Father Condamine having returned to Paris, and his

successor, Father Roux, to St. Louis, although once a week some priest, either Lazarist or secular, gave the Sisters mass and heard their confessions. At this period of depression they experienced great comfort in the presence of Bishop Bruté, who quite unexpectedly visited Kaskaskia, and remained with them several weeks, accepting, in default of a habitable parsonage, an apartment in their bake-house, where five or six little orphans lodged. Children and Sisters at this time, it should be borne in mind, were all crowded into one building, two or three children sleeping in each of the cells, while the play-room, besides, had to be turned into a dormitory at night. The Sisters, it will be observed, still had need of their skill in make-shifts; and, as usual, it stood them in good stead. At the south end of the east piazza they put up an awning, and, during the warm weather, used this as their refectory, exchanging it, when the weather grew cool, for one end of the kitchen. Their table consisted of two boards, tacked together, and supported on two barrels, one at each end. Mr. Wm. Morrison's black man, Reuben, was cook, and an excellent one, having served in this capacity on a steamboat. He was a man of tall stature, and always behaved with the utmost dignity and propriety, attending at his post quietly and promptly, without ever appearing flurried by supernumerary demands, and, when all were answered, standing with his hands behind his back, looking towards the reader, and listening with absorbing attention to "Rodriguez," or any other treatise on asceticism selected for the day; from which it was plain to see, if he did not understand the lesson, he perfectly understood the situation. After the Sisters had finished their meal, the children took theirs at the same table, there being no other. The chapel was at the end of the corridor, with the altar over the fire-place, and fronting the door looking down the passage. During mass the Sisters knelt in the cell-doors, and received communion at the chapel door, in which a chair was placed with a communion cloth across the back. The children went to mass on Sundays only, and knelt at the lower end of the passage and on the stairs. Into this temporary chapel Bishop Bruté, during his visit, used to steal, and pass hours before the Blessed Sacrament. The Sisters often met him, his breviary under his arm, going along in silence and on tiptoe, without raising his eyes, or stopping to speak to any one.

The permanent chapel, the reader must know, was assigned to the brick building, on which, as soon as the plastering in the frame building was done, the masons had got to work once more, and worked this time so diligently that it was roofed-in the same fall, enabling the carpenters in the course of the winter to finish the interior, which, in the following spring, was plastered and painted,

when the whole establishment at last was completed. Meantime, the Sisters were anxious to get into their permanent chapel before Christmas, and the workmen, willing to gratify them, made haste to lay the floor and lath the west end, the other walls being of brick. Plastering, though, was not to be thought of in winter, and the Sisters had to hang up quilts and other coverings to keep out the wind and cold, from which the flooring overhead also helped in some measure to protect them. As fire was indispensable, and there were no bricklayers at hand, Sister Josephine was given the job of laying the hearth. "First filling up the cavity with sand," she says, "I put down the bricks in regular files, to the admiration of all who saw it, and to the joy of those who feared we would freeze there on Christmas night." Yet, on that occasion, in spite of her handiwork, and the roaring fire it supported, the chapel was fearfully cold; and not on that occasion only. For a considerable part of the months of January and February they were obliged to move the altar up close to the fire, and even then to keep the cruets on the hearth until needed at the altar, when the Sister Sacristan put them in reach of the priest; a chafing-dish, withal, was kept on the altar. The convent itself, nominally finished, and wherein all were still packed, was in fact no more weather-proof than the half-finished chapel in the unfinished academy. Framed of unseasoned timbers, and weather-boarded without filling the interspaces, the shrinking of the lumber made wide gaps and crevices, through which the freezing winds swept unchecked. Many of these openings the Sisters stuffed up with tow; but, in rooms where this precaution was not taken, their feet ached with the cold. The music teachers were compelled to keep, under the pianos on which they gave lessons, boxes lined with buffalo skins, in which to wrap the feet. Nearly all the Sisters who had cloaks wore them throughout the day, or at least in the early hours of the morning—at meditation, mass, and the office. Several were obliged to make hoods and wear them. Sister Catherine Rose one day called them to look at pans on the fire, frozen on one side and stewing on the other. A number of empty cups and pitchers broke from the cold alone. "I, myself," Sister Josephine attests, "in attending a writing class, with two large fires in the room, one in the chimney-place and one in the stove, saw the ink freezing in the children's pens, and felt as if my feet would freeze off from the wind gushing under the washboards." On some of the most intensely cold days, they had to suspend school, for it was as much as the children could do to keep themselves warm hugging around the fire. The Sisters did not attempt to keep water in their cells, as the pitchers would have burst. A lay sister carried some around to each cell, or else a bucketful was placed before the fire in the assembly-room on the

same floor, whither the Sisters went half dressed to perform their ablutions. Basins of water, sitting under the stove from morning to night, were unthawed. Every morning the outer bedclothes would be covered with a thick frost—the frozen breath of the sleepers; and this frost would not disappear at sunrise, nor yet at noonday, but would generally lie, white and crisp, all day long. As if to crown their discomforts, they were forced to use lard lamps, with wicks of canton-flannel, sperm oil having given out or become very dear, and gas and coal-oil being practically unheard-of then. These lard lamps were very inconvenient, and half the time totally unserviceable. They were hard to light and harder to keep burning, going out as soon as the lard congealed, which was almost as soon as they were carried away from the fire, the work of liquefying and lighting anew taking never less than half an hour, and usually more. With all this, the lard, albeit so unsuited to the purpose, was expensive, for which reason the Sisters at night recreation commonly used a save-all, as they did in old times at Georgetown. Thus bravely they kept up the fight against night and winter till relieved by "the rolling year."

In the spring, as already mentioned, the academy was finished, and they took full possession of their new establishment. But although more comfortably and more monastically fixed, the site was less salubrious than that of the Old Hotel, and the health of the community was not so good as it had been there. The Sisters were nearly all broken down with the intermittent fever, which fastened on its victims with fearful pertinacity. Once attacked, it seemed impossible to get out of its fell grasp. Many became discouraged, and Mother Helen would sometimes burst into tears when information was brought her of some new one stricken down and put to bed. During the vacation, happening fortunately in the sickly season, scarcely were there Sisters enough up to nurse those who were sick, and fill the offices. As many as three at a time were in danger of death. In one summer four or five received the last sacraments, and two novices made their vows conditionally; but in general the sufferers recovered, to be attacked again upon the least exposure. Subsequently to the removal of the community from the Old Hotel, it buried three professed Sisters, one novice, one postulant, one pupil, one orphan child, and a holy secular man in its service. The latter, a Frenchman, of the name of Bouvet, deserves more than a passing mention. A gentleman by birth, a merchant of St. Louis, and a man of wealth and culture, he voluntarily impoverished himself, giving all his property to the Church. He went to Kaskaskia, where he was not known, and worked as journeyman to a Catholic carpenter, as pious as himself. Finally, he sought and obtained permission to live on

the premises of the Sisters, never charging them anything for his work, and at his death leaving them his effects, which included a library of French books. In dying the good man asked to be buried under the gateway of the convent cemetery; but this request, made in his humility, the Sisters denied in their reverence, and laid his body in a quiet nook of the cemetery. In the spring of 1837, it should be remarked, the community had made an urgent application to Georgetown for further assistance, in answer to which Sister Seraphina Wickham volunteered her services, two choir Sisters and a lay sister coming with her. A month after her arrival Sister Seraphina had been elected Superior, and was now, Christmas-tide, 1840, at the head of the community.

The following Christmas was saddened by the death of Sister De Chantal Brawner, who had entered as a postulant in 1836. Sister De Chantel died of typhoid fever, attended with delirium, her sufferings having continued for nine weeks, during which she had been watched by two Sisters night and day, to the exhaustion of the entire community. She was a large woman, of powerful constitution, the very vigor of whose resistance to disease sharpened the pangs of the struggle. Shortly before her death the clouds of delirium parted, and Father St. Cyr, seizing this lucid interval, administered the extreme unction and Viaticum, when darkness closed in upon her again, and she passed, through returning agonies, into the night that knows no morning on the earth. But this dreary Christmas was succeeded by some consolation. On the octave of the Epiphany the Sisters had the happiness of welcoming Bishop Kenrick, then newly-consecrated, and coadjutor to Bishop Rosati, who had been sent as legate or vicar apostolic to Hayti. The new Bishop immediately gave them a chaplain for their convent, and thenceforward they had the blessing of daily mass; in recognition of which they purchased a lot on the other side of the street, and built for their chaplain, Father Heim, a suitable house, wherein, besides living comfortably himself, he might entertain the Bishop when he should visit Kaskaskia. The house of the parish priest, as has been said, was dilapidated, in happy or unhappy unison with the parish church and sacristy, which had fallen into such ruin that the priest sent his best vestments for safe-keeping to the Sisters, who every Sunday and festival day had the vestment for the occasion carried to the church and brought back as soon as the service was over. In the belfry of the old church, to cap the scene, hung the old bell, also in ruins, presented by Louis XV. to the parish of Kaskaskia a century before, and which but the other day, with the consent of the present Bishop of the diocese, was sent to join the more famous relic from Independence Hall at the New Orleans Exhibition, where the cu-

rious visitor might have seen, side by side, the first bell that rang for worship in the West and the first that rang for liberty in all the land. After Bishop Kenrick's visit to Kaskaskia, which seems to have sent fresh life coursing through all the ecclesiastical veins and arteries of the old town, it was decided to build a new church and parsonage, and the work was promptly begun, and, with the help of the pastor's own hands, carried so far as the roofing-in and flooring of the church; when, being already used by the needy congregation, it was overtaken by the dire catastrophe to which we now draw near, and which was the end of ecclesiastical things and of nearly every thing else in Kaskaskia.

On May 12th, 1842, Sister Agnes Brent, the first Superior, was again elected, proving the last at Kaskaskia, as well as the first. The next year there was a division of the diocese, whereby Kaskaskia fell under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Chicago; but Bishop Kenrick, unwilling to lose the Visitation nuns altogether, notified Mother Agnes of his desire to establish a house in St. Louis, and requested her to proceed thither as its first Superior. With this request Mother Agnes made up her mind to comply, selecting, as her associates in the undertaking, Sister Beatrice Tyler, Sister Augustine Barber, Sister Josephine Barber, Sister Agatha Russel, and Sister Magdalene Cremur. On the morning of April 14th, 1844, accordingly, they left Kaskaskia for St. Louis, accompanied by two of the pupils and their father, Major Graham, son of the venerable Dr. C. C. Graham, of Louisville, Ky., whose centennial birthday was lately celebrated with so much *éclat*. A ride of thirty or forty minutes brought them to the bank of the Mississippi, whose waters, they noticed, were high, and still rising—the "little cloud like a man's hand," portending, had they known it, the coming cataclysm; but they did not read the sign. A steamboat upward bound presently heaving in sight, and rounding to at a signal from their party, they went aboard, and in six hours reached St. Louis, and were conveyed to the City Hospital, where for eight days the good Sisters of Charity lavished on them every possible attention and kindness, making those eight days so pleasant as to seem almost days of retreat. In the meantime they rented a house on Sixth street, which was fitting up, and into which some fortnight after their arrival they moved, although, not having a single article of furniture, they could not get settled until cupboards, tables, desks, benches, and the like, were made, and pianos, globes, maps, and all school apparatus and kitchen utensils provided. They were even without bedsteads, and, till these could be got, had to sleep on the floor, the Sisters of Charity lending them pillows. As in the foundation they had left behind them at Kaskaskia, their work began at the beginning.

But before they had fairly entered upon it, the foundation at Kaskaskia, sad to say, was toppling to its fall. The catastrophe came on apace. Two weeks after the departure of Mother Agnes and her associates, the Kaskaskia river, ordinarily two feet lower than the Mississippi now at extraordinary height, began to swell and flood the fields lying between it and the convent garden. On the feast of St. Aloysius the garden was half covered with water, and the Sisters made their last procession in honor of the Sacred Heart over two of the upper walks that continued dry. That night the whole garden was inundated, and at eleven o'clock the following day the water rushed into the cellar. The next morning the well caved in during mass. The situation had now become serious; for the surface soil of the Kaskaskia plain lay on a stratum of quicksand, and it was feared, not without reason, that the entire town would sink in the mighty flood. The Sisters were urged to leave; and at six oclock the same evening, Mr. Amadée Menard, son of Col. P. Menard, brought a flat-boat, propelled by stout rowers, and, taking Mother Isabella and a good many Sisters, conveyed them to his own dwelling on the bluffs east of the river. This was Saturday evening. The Sisters thus brought off probably had no Mass the next morning, but Father St. Cyr said Mass at the convent for those who remained; and immediately after, the Sunday obligation having been dispensed with, they began packing up, and spent the day in hard work, bundling and sewing, covering carefully with cloths their best pictures and ornaments, and taking down every thing belonging to the altar and chapel, where Mass would never again be celebrated. At breakfast time, they took notice, the bricks in the kitchen sank when they stepped on them, and one end of their refectory was now submerged, making it certain that the first floor, though several feet above the ground, would be entirely under water before night; hence, after packing up, they hastily carried tables, dishes, provisions, utensils and furniture to the assembly-room on the floor overhead, where they passed the remainder of this memorable Sunday, at the close of which they, too, quit their doomed convent, and were rowed to the Bluffs. Col. Pierre Menard, the late proprietor of the mansion on the Bluffs, had just been laid in his grave beneath the weltering waters, having been spared the pain of witnessing the destruction of his beloved convent, the object of his solicitude even in his dying hours. When told on his death-bed of the rapid rise of the Mississippi and Kaskaskia, he said repeatedly, "How are the Sisters?" enjoining his sons to take care of them. He was pre-eminently their benefactor. Their convent in effect had been built up and maintained by him. In the purchase of the land, and in the payment of the notes on the building, he cheerfully

advanced the money, whenever, as happened too often, their means fell short. Neither did he for several years demand any interest, and, when at length he did, it was on the most indulgent terms. Besides, he educated at their school his numerous granddaughters and nieces, and most of their other pupils were obtained through his influence. He died only a few days before the submersion of their grounds, and his house, as we have seen, became their refuge.

Meanwhile, Bishop Kenrick, who had heard nothing of the distress of his nuns, was on the way to Kaskaskia, with their new Bishop, the Rt. Rev. W. Quarter, accompanied also by the Rev. J. Timon and Father de St. Palais, both of whom afterwards became bishops. Bishop Quarter supposed, as did the others, that he was simply to make the acquaintance of a flourishing community that had signalized its transfer to his jurisdiction by giving birth to a new community, destined to flourish likewise in the original diocese; but far different was the meeting. They found, in place of what they had anticipated, the convent abandoned and the homeless Sisters and children crowded together at the Menard mansion, around which the houseless people of the town had taken refuge under tents and awnings. The arrival of the episcopal party, which was at noon on Monday, proved opportune, for the Menard family, it may be imagined, knew not what to do with the Sisters and their pupils, the latter, I should note, numbering sixteen, all the rest of the fifty composing the convent school at the beginning of the flood having been withdrawn by their friends. Father Heim had gone in quest of a boat, but without success, no captain he saw being willing to come up to Kaskaskia. Father Timon now set out on the same errand, and, hailing a steamboat on its way to St. Louis, induced the captain to put out his own cargo, and turn his boat into the Kaskaskia river. Early on Wednesday morning, June 26th, 1844, before daybreak, the puffing of the rescuing steamer was heard at the Menard dwelling. Mr. Amadée Menard sprang from his bed, and, half dressed, ran out to warn the captain against some dangerous spot in the channel, but was relieved of this necessity on seeing Father Timon standing aloft near the wheel, and directing the pilot. After breakfast, all got on board, and steamed for the convent, of which only one-half appeared above water. A portion of the piazza balustrade was sawed off, and the boat lashed to the house through the doors and windows; whereupon the bishops and priests led the way in carrying the furniture on board, the Sisters, for their part, lifting whatever their strength would permit. The pianos, harps, stoves, desks, benches, and such things, were put in the hold to serve as ballast. By one o'clock in the afternoon the boat had been loaded as heavily as was safe; and the Sisters,

bidding adieu forever to their long-loved convent and to Kaskaskia, turned their course towards St. Louis, where they arrived at dawn the next morning: and the sorrowful exodus was accomplished. The steamboat, after unloading, returned to Kaskaskia for the remainder of their furniture, while they, with their pupils, were taken to the house on Sixth street, occupied, it will be remembered, by the Sisters from whom they had recently parted, and who, going forth to found a community, turned out but heralds of the parent house, which, instead of planting a new foundation, transplanted its own. Yet two years were to elapse before the divided community should be restored to unity.

The house on Sixth street was much too small to accommodate the whole community, but the rescued Sisters, not knowing where else to go, remained in it two days and two nights, when Mrs. Thomas, a lady of wealth, came and took six of them out to her newly-enlarged residence in the country. Pending the uncertainty as to their future abode, Mrs. Ann Biddle, sister-in-law of Gen. W. S. Harney, offered them and their pupils a home in her own family, and this generous offer, when Bishop Quarter's proposal to remove them to Chicago had been definitively overruled, they accepted; and early on the following Monday carriages were sent to take them to her dwelling on Fifth street, which was now transformed into both a school and a convent. Mrs. Biddle's house was very large, and she gave up to the use of the refugees all the apartments, excepting one only, her own bedroom, the servants lodging in a back building. She supplied the table of the Sisters, and attended to their every want. Their meals were prepared by her own cook, two of the lay sisters assisting. On the 26th of July, the feast of her patroness, St. Ann, a general communion was offered for this benefactress, and Bishop Kenrick celebrated mass at her house for the same intention. Her back parlor served as the chapel, she having, besides, two front parlors. Mrs. Biddle on the occasion treated the community to a grand *fête*, every feature of which was in sumptuous style. Her kindness did not stop here. After entertaining the Sisters and their sixteen pupils for a full month, she established them, during the summer vacation and before the opening of the first session of their school, in her spacious mansion on Broadway, where the pupils enjoyed the advantage of extensive grounds, with delightful walks and shades. Their school increasing, they built, by the advice of the Bishop, a two-storied structure, containing a dormitory and a play-room, each about forty feet by twenty, with a flight of stairs leading from one to the other. The lower room answered the purpose of study-hall, class-room, and wash-room, as well as play-room. When they left, the Bishop, as he had engaged, took this building at cost, and had it rolled over

to St. Patrick's Church, for the use of the parish school. Mrs. Biddle charged the Sisters for her mansion and premises only a nominal rent, the payment of which, it is believed, was never exacted. The Superior of the Broadway division was Sister Isabella King, under whose charge the last days at Kaskaskia had been spent and the final escape effected. Naturally, her thoughts reverted to that devastated seat of the community, and renewed her solicitude to discharge the pecuniary obligations contracted there. The heirs of Col. P. Menard held the notes of the convent for seventeen thousand dollars, at five per cent. interest. The Sisters, troubled by this indebtedness, endeavored to sell the convent land and buildings at any sacrifice, and had the property advertised for a year in the newspapers of the great eastern cities; but nothing came of it. At length they proposed to the Menard heirs to pay down one-third of the debt in ready money, give the equivalent of another third in schooling, and surrender the land and house for the remaining third. This proposal the heirs agreed to, and the burden which had weighed so heavily on the community was removed.

In July, 1846, after two years of separation, the Sisters on Broadway and those on Sixth street were reunited, taking possession of the Archbishop's place on Ninth street, under Mother Agnes as Superior, the health of Mother Isabella at the time disabling her for the office. Here the community, permanently unified, remained twelve years, enjoying the spiritual blessing of a close proximity to the Lazarist Fathers, who during that time served the convent as chaplains, confessors, and spiritual directors. Here, too, the Sisters built up, on the solid basis of their past but relatively obscure achievements, that splendid superstructure of academic instruction, the fame of which casts lustre upon the West, and does honor to the whole Union. On September 10th, 1846, almost coincident with the reunion of the community, occurred the death of Sister Teresa Lalor, whom our readers will remember as the first Superior of the mother house at Georgetown. Her light went out just as the torch kindled at its flame began to burn with steady brilliancy. In June, 1848, Sister Genevieve King, one of the most loved and most lovable of the community, was elected Superior. Pending the election, a letter came from Bishop Portier, of Mobile, requesting the community to lend his house in that city two or three members. In compliance with this request, the deposed Mother, Sister Agnes Brent, with Sister Helen Flannigan, Sister Augustine Barber, and Sister Cecelia Del Vecchio, left soon afterwards for Mobile, where the latter two Sisters died, Sisters Agnes and Helen returning after a stay of four years. The triennial of Mother Genevieve's government was a period of trials as well as

of blessings. The chief of the former was the interruption of the school twice by pestilence; and among the latter must be included the visit, in the spring of 1850, of the celebrated Father Theobald Mathew, who edified the community in various ways, and to whom its members had the consolation of going to confession. At the close of this triennial the convent elected as its Superior Sister Isabella King, cousin of Sister Genevieve, and one of the most efficient and acceptable administrators it has known.

About this time, Bishop Loras, of Dubuque, wishing to establish a house in his diocese, applied to the Sisters for a colony, which, however, they were unable to spare, the growth of their seminary crowding hard upon their means of teaching, and rendering them more disposed to borrow than lend. Some time in 1852, therefore, Bishop Loras, on behalf of his project, sent one of his priests, Father de Villars, to the house of Monlud, near Lyons, France, the uncle of this priest being at the time, and having been for many years, chaplain and confessor to that community. Father de Villars, on his way to Europe, called at St. Louis. As Mother Isabella remembered with pleasure the French Sisters (models of perfect observance and of every religious virtue) whom she had known at Georgetown, she strongly desired to reinforce her community by two or three such as they, and judged this a favorable opportunity to obtain them. Accordingly, with Archbishop Kenrick's consent, she wrote to Paris by Father de Villars, who, in June, 1853, returned with two Sisters for St. Louis from the First Monastery of Paris, along with his own colony from Monlud. These colonists remained with the St. Louis Sisters about two months to study English, and on their departure for Keokuk, the destined seat of the new house, took with them two of their late entertainers to assist in the school. The two Sisters from Paris stayed at St. Louis a twelvemonth, when one, Sister Augustine Borgia, gave her services to the Keokuk house for a year or more, and then went back to Paris; the other, Sister Frances Gonzaga, returned directly to Paris, where, in the fall of 1869, the writer had the pleasure of seeing her, still far from what Victor Hugo calls the youth of age, and in the full bloom of her conventual graces.

In the interim, a home for the community, suited to its thriving state and commanding reputation, had been in course of erection on Cass Avenue, and at length neared completion. The lot on which this edifice was built, it is proper to say, had been bequeathed to the Sisters by Mrs. Ann Biddle, the excellent lady, meanwhile deceased, who had befriended them in the days of the flood, and whose benefactions ended only with her life. The time now approached for their last removal. The extensive additions they had made to

the archiepiscopal buildings on Ninth street the Archbishop received in lieu of rent, and in the spring of 1858 they were installed in their permanent home; from which have gone forth, as had gone forth in lesser number from previous stations of the community, pupils who are or were the heads and ornaments of households, not only in every section of the Republic, but in many of the princely seats of Europe. It has been, as it is, a teeming hive of sound and elegant culture. In this home the community abides; and with its stately grandeur are now associated, by inheritance or acquirement, all the respect and all the renown achieved, through harsh vicissitudes, in more than half a century of labor and of sacrifice, stretching away from this superb consummation in the great metropolis of the valley back to the humble beginnings at Kaskaskia, and studded throughout, not less thickly in the opening than elsewhere, with shining deeds and heroic sufferings. Yet the consummation alone, engrossing the honor of the whole career, fixes the public gaze. Nor is this unnatural. It is ever so. The triumphant present, filling the eyes of men, is everything; the militant past, unknown or forgotten, is nothing. Nevertheless, it is not just, even to the crowning state; for the present, sundered from the past, is shorn in part of its true glory; and it is the purpose of this paper, by recalling the past of a great Institute and linking it with the present, to do, in some imperfect measure, justice to both.

Here we take leave of the Visitation Convent of St. Louis, reminding the reader, however, that we do so at a period distant a quarter of a century, in which the house has enlarged and heightened its fame, and, despite the clouds, and hailstorms, and thunderbolts of civil war (part of which it saw and all of which it felt), has strengthened its firm hold on the esteem and admiration of the country. The chapter of the civil war forms, indeed, one of the most thrilling and not the least creditable in the history of the convent. But our task is done. Having traced the rise of the community from the first streaks of dawn in the east, through gloom and tempest, to the unclouded zenith, we may fitly stand aside; its noontide splendor proclaims itself. Yet we may linger to note an incident not less grateful than pathetic. Of the noble company of the founders, one alone survives—Sister Josephine Barber; who but very recently celebrated the completion of the fiftieth year of her profession—her golden jubilee. May the life of this devout and gifted woman long be spared to the community which for two generations she has served and adorned.

WHAT ARE ANIMALS AND PLANTS?

THIS question: "What are animals and plants?" is a large question. In order to be able to reply to it we must know both (1) what animals and plants are, as contrasted with substances which are neither the one nor the other; and (2) how animals and plants stand towards each other—their relations and their differences. Only by learning these two things can we possibly know what animals and plants *are*.

The common sense, however, of the overwhelming majority of men will make short work of the first question; they will say: "Animals and plants are *living things*, while all other visible substances are but composed of *dead matter*." Now, we have no quarrel with common sense, we fully accept its dictates, but the patient and admirable researches of generations of men of science, and the speculations of modern philosophers, have made known so many curious phenomena, and have brought forward so many objections, that it is no longer possible for him who would be able to give an account of the belief that is in him concerning the world and its inhabitants, to rest satisfied with such a rough and ready reply.

Similarly, with regard to the second question,—the relations between animals and plants,—most men would, perhaps, reply that "animals are living creatures, which move about, and get their living by the help of their senses, while plants are living creatures devoid of sense and, for the most part, rooted to the ground."

Now, this is really a very good answer, as far as it goes, and truly expresses the distinction existing between the immense majority of the two groups of living things. Nevertheless, here again the discovery of fresh phenomena has brought us face to face with difficulties and puzzles, some of which seem, as yet, insoluble.

To put as shortly as possible what appears to be the outcome of modern scientific progress, it has, on the one hand, served to render more marked the distinction between living beings and creatures devoid of life; while, on the other hand, it has continually made more and more evident that (in spite of the distinctions between most of them) animals and plants form one great whole, and must be scientifically treated together, as well as separately.

Thus, to the two sciences of zoölogy and botany, which refer to animals and plants respectively, we have now added a fresh science, the science of Biology, which treats of animals and plants taken together, collectively, as forming *one great group*.

That the reader may have some faint notion how vast this great

group is, it may be well hastily to survey the main classes of creatures which together compose it. We think it desirable to do so, because very inadequate images are apt to rise before the minds of most persons unacquainted with natural science, when they use such words as "animals" and "plants," since they naturally think most of those with which they are the most familiar.

Thus, they are familiar with certain beasts, birds, reptiles, and fishes, but know little of the number of them. Of birds, ten thousand distinct kinds are known, and upwards of four thousand kinds of lizards, and sixteen hundred kinds of snakes have been described; while fishes are so rich in species that they probably equal in the number of their kinds the whole mass of beasts, birds, and reptiles taken together!

But such creatures as these form but a very small proportion of all animals. Creatures such as snails and oysters form another vast group, known as "mollusks."

Worms, also, have been formed into a division, so varied in nature and so prodigious in number that their proper classification is amongst the most difficult of zoölogical problems.

The star fishes and their allies constitute another great group, rich both in species and diversities of form.

But the whole of the creatures we have yet referred to, taken together in one mass, are far exceeded in number of species by the class of insects alone, of which one or more are associated with the life of each and every land plant, and probably that of every higher animal also; while closely allied to the insects are the multitudinous tribes of lobsters, shrimps, crabs, spiders, and scorpions.

We have also to take into account those coral animals which have actually built up large tracts of the earth's habitable surface; and besides these, we have their humble followers, the sponges.

All the creatures yet referred to are cognizable by our ordinary senses, but there are, as is commonly known, myriads of kinds, either so small as to be altogether invisible to the naked eye, or else invisible as regards the main points of their structure without the aid of the microscope. All the lowest animals, the bodies of which are not made up of distinct organic substances, or tissues, are called PROTOZOA.

Then, as to plants: besides the families of flowering trees, shrubs, creepers, and herbs, with members of which we unconsciously become more or less familiar, there are a multitude of other families, specimens of which we only see in our occasional visits to the hot houses of our botanical gardens. To these follow the almost numberless kinds of plants which do *not* flower—the ferns, horsetails, grasses, lichens, seaweeds (with their fresh-water allies), and

fungi. Parallel with the microscopic creatures ordinarily classed as "animals," are the microscopic plants, some of which have been, till of late years, the despair of the surgeon, while others are now recognized as, or suspected to be, the cause and origin of the most painful and dangerous diseases.

Multitudinous, however, as is the animal and vegetable life which we have about us to-day, it is but a remnant of that of which this planet has been the theatre; and especially wonderful are the discoveries of fossil remains which have been made in North America, revealing to us the past existence of living forms such as had not been pictured even in the recorded musings of any naturalist. Apart from such wonderful scientific novelties, we have in the ancient chalk cliffs, and the far more ancient coal-fields, abundant evidence of the prodigality and duration of past vitality; the chalk as it were still in process of formation, as the ooze slowly forming in the bed of the Atlantic Ocean; the coal affording evidence that rich vegetable life flourished at a period so remote that, during it, the first appearance of the chalk might have seemed as the dream of an infinitely distant future.

It is this immensely complex mass of living beings which we have to regard, in their totality, as one whole, as well as in their two component groups, if we would know what "animals" and "plants" really are.

But in order that we may learn *what* they are, it will be well first to advert briefly to one or two facts concerning things which are neither plants nor animals, certain facts, that is, about the "*inorganic* world," by which we mean the solid earth with its two envelopes—water and air. All the substances of which this inorganic world is composed are either (1) elements, such, *e. g.*, as the gas oxygen or the metal iron; or (2) compounds of elements, such, *e. g.*, as rust, which consists of oxygen and iron united to form a third substance which is neither the one nor the other.

Very many substances can exist (as water can) in three states, solid (ice), fluid (water), aëriform (vapor).

A solid inorganic substance may be either in the form of crystal (as marble) or not crystalline (as chalk), while having all the time the same chemical composition. Thus both marble and chalk can be resolved into (1) lime and (2) a gas, commonly known as carbonic acid gas, and carbonic acid is again resolvable into (1) oxygen and (2) carbon, or pure charcoal.

The *aëriform* envelope of this planet, that is AIR, is a mixture of the two gases (1) oxygen and (2) nitrogen, with some carbonic acid gas and a certain amount of ammonia and the vapor of water.

Oxygen, itself incombustible, is the great burner or aider of combustion.

Nitrogen is remarkable at once both for its own inertness and for its instability; so that it is an ingredient in all the most explosive compounds, such as gunpowder, guncotton, nitroglycerine and the iodide, sulphide, and chloride of nitrogen.

Of *carbonic acid* there are ordinarily but four cubic feet in ten thousand cubic feet of air; yet so great is the quantity of it contained in the whole atmosphere that there are reckoned to be 371,475 tons of it in the column of atmosphere which extends above each square mile of the earth's surface.

Water, the earth's *fluid* envelope, consists of oxygen, hydrogen, carbonic acid, ammonia, carbonate of lime, flint (in solution), and sundry salts. It is, as it were, the mother substance of life, both historically and physiologically, and has been a great agent in both the production and the destruction of fossil remains: the first, by its *deposits;* the second, by its *eroding agency*. The Mississippi has formed thirty thousand square miles of deposits, which are in places several hundred feet thick. The Ganges carries down yearly to the sea as much mud as could be carried down by 730,000 ships, each of 1400 tons' burthen. The eroding and destructive agency of water is, on the other hand, notorious.

With these preliminary notices concerning the inorganic or non-living world, we may next review such contrasts as may be drawn between it and the living world, of animals and plants, considered as one whole.

I. Now, in the first place, some inorganic substances are fluid and some solid, some moist and some dry; but every living creature, without exception, is more or less fluid, and composed to a greater or less degree of water, especially its more actively vital or growing parts.

Thus, in the human brain, seventy out of every hundred parts are composed of water, and in the jelly-fish no less than ninety-nine parts out of a hundred are so composed.

II. Many inorganic substances, such as crystals, are bounded by flat surfaces and straight lines, but living creatures have bodies which are bounded by curved surfaces and lines.

III. The chemical composition of inorganic substances is most various; some, like gold, consist of but a single element; others, like water, of two elements; others of several and very different ones.

All living bodies, on the other hand, are of very uniform chemical composition, as they invariably consist of oxygen, hydrogen, and carbon, together with the element nitrogen—the unstable nature of which has already been referred to in speaking of the in-

organic compounds containing nitrogen, which thus seems a fitting element to enter into the composition of anything so prone to change as is living matter.

IV. In every animal and plant these four elements (oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, and nitrogen) unite to form a special substance known as *protoplasm*, of which every living organism is at first entirely composed, while the whole inorganic world is destitute of such material.

This curious substance, while living, has six very remarkable powers:

(1.) A power of internal circulation, or of the movement of various parts of its substance within the whole, unlike anything in the inorganic world.

(2.) A power of contraction and expansion under conditions different from those which contract and expand inorganic substances.

(3.) A power of performing chemical changes and evolving heat more gently and continuously than in the combustion of inorganic bodies.

(4.) A power of converting other adjacent substances into material like itself—into its own substance.

(5.) A power of forming from its own substance substances both different from its own and from substances adjacent to it. Thus it is that since every living creature consists at first entirely of protoplasm, every *other* kind of substance found in every animal or plant comes from protoplasm and is formed by its agency.

(6.) A power of exchanging gases with its environment—notably of absorbing oxygen and giving out carbonic acid.

These exclusively vital powers of living particles of protoplasm give to each whole organism of which they form a part certain further characters by which they all differ from the inorganic world. Thus:

V. Every living creature, whether plant or animal, effects that interchange of gases just mentioned (absorbing oxygen and giving out carbonic acid), that is to say, it respires or breathes—whatever other changes it may effect.

VI. Every living being is a creature requiring food, which it has the power of changing into its own substance, and so, at least for a time, augmenting its size by a process of growth. This growth is not a mere *external* increment, like the growth of a crystal suspended in a suitable medium, but is an augmentation of its intimate innermost substance by what is called *intussusception*.

VII. Every living creature thus grows according to a more or less definite law, from a single, minute, spheroidal mass of protoplasm into that shape and structure which is characteristic of the group to which it belongs.

VIII. In this process each such creature forms certain substances which are *not* protoplasm,—at the very least it forms minute granules which may be fatty or starchy; while, generally, living creatures *do* form the most complex structures, namely, all those found in the animal and vegetable kingdoms—the woods, resins, oils and sugars of plants, and all the varied components of the bodies of animals; this process is known as "*secretion*."

By this latter process the living world, as one whole, is continually taking matter from the earth's aërial and aqueous envelopes and adding it to the substance of the earth's solid crust. The past effect of this action we see, as before mentioned, in the enormous fields of coal and peat; in the extensive chalk formations and coral reefs (one reef extending for a thousand miles along the coast of Australia, and such structures forming a great part of Florida); in the vast accumulations of fossil remains—evidenced by the fact that the fossil ear bones of whales (a valuable manure) have given rise to a lawsuit, and by the five million cubic feet of shell sand annually collected on the shores of Devon and Cornwall.

As to the present activity of the vegetable world in this direction, we have but to recollect that the Empire of Brazil is mainly a forest region which may be roughly represented as an equilateral triangle, each side of which is twelve hundred miles long, and that other vast regions of the earth's surface are, like it, clothed not only with herbage, but with teeming vegetable produce of all kinds and dimensions.

Now, if we suppose two-thirds of the earth's dry land to be clothed with only such vegetation as may be estimated to produce an average increase of its substance, amounting to but one three hundred and sixty-fifth part of an inch daily, then we should have freshly formed each year as much vegetal matter as would constitute a cube fifteen miles in extent in each of such cube's three dimensions!

IX. But living creatures not only grow and develop their own bodies; they also reproduce their kind; and this is again an action to which there is nothing comparable or analogous in the whole inorganic world.

Thus every living being may be said to be a creature possessing an innate tendency to undergo a definite cycle of changes when exposed to certain fixed conditions; that is, when supplied with an adequate amount of temperature, moisture, suitable gaseous matter, food, etc. Inorganic and dead substances may tend to undergo a *series* of changes, but such series never constitutes a "*cycle*"—*i.e.*, a series returning to the point whence it set out. We see such a *cycle* of changes in the egg, the chick, the fowl, and the egg again; or the egg, the grub, the chrysalis, the butterfly, and ultimately its

egg; or the seed, the young plant, the mature plant, the flower, the fruit, and the seed again.

Inorganic substances tend simply to persist as they are, and have no definite relations either to the past or to the future. Whence it comes, or what it has been or shall be, is nothing to its present being—which is its *only* being. But every living creature, at every step of its life, regards both the past and the future, and thus lives continually in a definite relation to both these as well as to the present. Every stage of its cycle of life, just because it *is* a cycle, is conditioned by the anterior states which alone have made it possible, and refers to future states for which it is in active preparation. Thus, as it were, at every present moment of its existence, it lives *both* in the past and in the future, a mode of existence which attains its fullest development in the highest living organism—man, the one creature emphatically, because consciously, "looking before and after!"

X. But living creatures present another still more distinctive character, one which is indeed but obscurely indicated in plants, but is very evident in animals. This is *the power of forming habits*, which is itself the sign of the possession of a special *internal spontaneity* in living things, by which they each and all tend to act and to "*react*" *when acted upon.*

For what is a "habit?" A "habit" is not formed by repeated actions, though it may be strengthened and confirmed by them. If an act performed *once only* had not in it *some* power of generating a "habit," then a thousand repetitions of that act would not generate it. Habit is the determination in one definite direction of a previously vague tendency to action. All living organisms tend to act. With them action is not only their nature, 'tis a positive *want.* Moreover, within limits, the powers and energies of living creatures increase with action, and diminish, and finally perish, through repose. Thus the general activity and power of organisms, and also the exercise of this power in definite modes and directions, are facilitated and increased by actions in the very first of which the power of "generating habit" lies hid.

This second, mysterious, internal tendency, as we have said, eminently distinguishes living organisms from all inorganic bodies, and leads naturally to the next point we would refer to.

Closely allied to habit is *instinct*, a power, the presence of which cannot indeed be adduced as a character distinguishing all living beings from bodies devoid of life, but which none the less is so remarkable a property of many animals that it may well claim, *for our present purpose*, to be here briefly referred to in passing.

We have no space here to describe at length examples of animal instinct; we can but very briefly refer to such well-known instances

as the simulated lameness of certain birds, the insects which become quiescent to escape an enemy (what is wrongly called shamming death), and provision for the future, as in the wasp sphex, the carpenter bee and the stag beetle. Certain instincts, however, have a very peculiar significance; such are those by which a grub will repair its injured cocoon or a spider its injured web, and those by which lobsters and crabs, when one of their limbs is injured, will throw off the injured stump as far up as one of its joints, whence alone the limb can again grow forth and be reproduced. Such creatures cannot be supposed to *know* the effect of such spontaneous amputations, and therefore their actions lead us naturally to consider other unconscious organic actions by which lost parts are more or less perfectly reproduced—actions which display a purpose and intention (although unconscious) in a way which resembles nothing in the inorganic world.

In the process of healing and repair of a wounded part of our body, a fluid, perfectly structureless, substance is secreted, or poured forth from the parts about the wound. In this substance small particles of protoplasm, called "cells," arise and become abundant, so that the substance, at first structureless, becomes what is called "cellular tissue." Then, by degrees, this structure transforms itself into vessels, tendons, nerves, bone, and membrane—into some or all such parts—according to circumstances.

In a case of broken bone its two broken ends soften, their sharp edges thus disappearing. Then a soft substance is secreted, and this becomes at first gelatinous, often afterwards cartilaginous, and, finally, osseous or bony. But not only do these different matters arise and develop themselves in such a neutral substance, but very complex structures, appropriately formed and nicely adjusted for the performance of varied functions, may also be developed. Thus a certain railway guard had his arm so injured that he was compelled to have the elbow, with its joint, cut out; but he afterwards developed a new joint almost as good as the old one. In the uninjured condition of these parts, the outer bone of the lower arm—the *radius*—ends above in a smooth-surfaced cup, which plays against part of the lower end of the bone of the upper arm, or *humerus*, while its side also plays against the side of the other bone of the lower arm (called the *ulna*) with the interposition of a cartilaginous surface. The *radius* and *ulna* are united to somewhat descending processes, at the lower end of the humerus, by dense and strong membranes or ligaments. Such was the condition of the parts which were removed by the surgeon. Nine years after the operation the patient died, and the well-known surgeon, Mr. Syme, had the opportunity of dissecting the arm, which in the meantime had served the poor man perfectly well, he having been

in the habit of swinging himself by it from one carriage to another while the train was in motion, quite as easily and securely as with the other arm. On examination Mr. Syme found that the amputated end of the radius had formed fresh polished surfaces and played both against the *humerus* and *ulna* as before, a sort of cartilaginous material being freshly interposed. The ends of the bones of the forearm were again locked in by two freshly formed descending processes of the humerus, and were again joined to the latter by freshly formed strong and dense ligaments. Repairs of injuries of a far more surprising kind are found amongst the lower animals, and repair in the vegetal world is so common that it ceases to excite our surprise. Such unconscious and purposive organic actions are allied to instinctive action, using that term in a wide analogical sense. But *truly* instinctive actions take place IN US at the dawn of life. It is by the aid of such alone that the infant lives. Instinctive also are many of the phenomena of adolescence and those of the earlier years of our own race—for no one can maintain that the first beginnings of literature, art, science, or politics were ever deliberately invented.

How, then, are we to regard that great world of living creatures, both the lower and the higher members of which present phenomena so different from anything to be found in the whole inorganic world? Are, or are not, the bodies of animals and plants vehicles for the exhibition of some force or energy radically different from any to be found in the non-living world about them, or are all their actions to be regarded as only the very curious activities of very complex machines, moved by no other power than such as are inherent in the inanimate matters of this planet? Are we, in a word, to accept a merely mechanical explanation of the universe, or must we demand something more, and if so, what?

To many of our readers it may seem altogether absurd to attempt to explain the phenomena of life in terms of the movements of solid particles. Their common sense revolts at such an explanation, but "common-sense" cannot be allowed by itself to decide any question when an appeal has once been made to the higher tribunal of pure reason, and such an appeal *has* been made.

For there can be no question but that a thoroughly mechanical conception of nature is the scientific ideal of a very large and a very influential school of thinkers, and is the goal towards which they strive—following the footsteps of their great predecessor Descartes. Thus Kirchenhoff tells us that "the highest object at which the natural sciences are constrained to aim, is the reduction of all the phenomena of nature to mechanics." Helmholz has declared that "the aim of the natural sciences is to resolve themselves into mechanics." According to Wundt, "the problem of physi-

ology is a reduction of vital phenomena to general physical laws, and ultimately to the fundamental laws of mechanics;" and Haeckel tells us that "all natural phenomena without exception, from the motions of the celestial bodies to the growth of plants and the consciousness of men . . . . . are ultimately to be reduced to atomic mechanics."

Many, if not most, of the scientific men of our day strongly favor a mechanical explanation of nature, and treat with disfavor, not to say contempt, the conception of a distinct *kind* of energy or a "VITAL FORCE"—a conception which has been maintained by a school of physiologists called on that account "*vitalists*."

Now it is surely not to be supposed that this preference for "mechanism" by so many distinguished men of science can be due to any mere prejudice on their part, or that there are not some good and substantial reasons *why* they should favor it, and yet it is hard to suppose that the common sense of mankind, which has ever opposed the mechanical view, can be entirely due to a mere delusion either, and have *no* solid support from reason!

Let us first for a moment consider what is the aim and end of all physical science. Surely it is to understand the coexistences and successions of natural phenomena in such a way that they can not only be arranged in convenient groups suitable for the limited powers of the human intellect to grasp, but also serve as a basis of scientific prediction—while the coming true of "predictions" which men of science feel justified in making affords a strong ground for believing that the operations which served as a basis for such fulfilled predictions were themselves true.

Thus, as regards the science of astronomy, who does not now see that our conceptions of the motions of the heavenly bodies have been greatly facilitated by the discovery of the law of gravitation? and who does not perceive in the verification of scientific prophecy, by the discovery of the planet Neptune, a signal triumph of modern astronomical science?

Nevertheless, the fulfilment of predictions alone will not always suffice to prove the absolute truth of the views upon which they are supposed to be based, or else the prediction of eclipses by astronomers who followed the Ptolemaic system would have proved the truth of that erroneous theory.

Bearing in mind, however, the aim and end of physical science, let us next glance at the only means which it is in the power of scientific men to use. These means are the employment of present sense-impressions, together with the reproduction in the investigation of groups of past sense-impressions.

All our knowledge is called forth by the play of surrounding nature upon our sense-organs; nor can we imagine *anything* which

we have not previously had sensuous experience of—at least in its elements or component parts.

Again, there is a quality of distinctness and vividness in our sense-impressions. How vague, for example, is our imagination of a perfume, compared with our imagination of a visible triangular figure, or of a cube, or of a ball, held in the hand?

It is especially what is *visible* and *tangible* that comes home most readily to the imagination; vague internal sensations are always described by us in terms of sight or touch. We speak of a "*gnawing*" pain, a "*sharp*" pain, *like a knife*, a "*rough*" taste, and even a "*bright*" intellect, and a "*hard*" heart.

Now, the "explanation" of any phenomenon may be its reference to the causes which produce it; but its "explanation" is very often nothing more than the assigning of some new or unfamiliar object to a class of objects which has already become familiar; and our minds are so formed that they feel an almost inevitable satisfaction in the reference of some object or action, difficult or impossible to imagine, to a class of objects or actions easy to imagine, and this whether or not such reference, when closely examined, turns out to be really justifiable, and therefore truly satisfactory.

Now there is nothing so easy for us to imagine as the motions of solid bodies, phenomena which appeal both to sight and touch. Thus it is that (apart from scientific utilities we shall shortly refer to) "heat," "light," "chemical phenomena," the action of nerves and of brain cells, are apt to appear easier to understand, and to be more or less "explained," when they are spoken of as "Modes of Motion."

Nevertheless, such an explanation of the action of living beings is, as we have said, shocking to common sense, and therefore, as has just been mentioned, another force was invented to account for them, and the actions of living beings have been explained as being due to the energizing within them of a "Vital Force."

But the doctrine of the existence of any such force has been more and more successfully opposed by men of science on the ground that (1) living beings are *not* isolated phenomena in nature, but are affected by and react upon all physical forces; (2) that no distinct evidence is forthcoming of the existence of any such "vital force;" and (3) that while the use of such a conception in no way furthers the ends of science, the mechanical conception of nature aids in the discovery of natural laws, and has powerfully helped on the progress of science.

And it is true that living beings are *far indeed* from being isolated; for the life of each largely consists of an interplay between what we consider its own body and environing nature. So intimate, in fact, is the connection between each of us and his environ-

ment, that it is even difficult to determine, in minute detail, the line of separation between the two. Food, even when swallowed, is not yet "the tissue." When digested and entering the absorbents which convey it to the bloodvessels which carry it to the intimate tissues of the body, who can say exactly how soon the foreign body becomes the living being, or precisely when and where it is transformed into our very substance? It is the same with the streams of air carrying inwards the life-sustaining oxygen and outwards the deleterious vapors. By such agencies the outer world blends with us and we with it. Far from finding any such indubitable evidence of the existence of a "vital force," as we have of those phenomena we speak of as "heat," "motion," and "light," each living organism thus viewed purely from the standpoint of *physical science* seems, in the words of a distinguished German philosopher, Lotze, only as a place in space where the matter, the forces and the motions of the general course of Nature meet each other in relations favorable for the production of vital phenomena. These phenomena excite our admiration, as do the phenomena of heat and pictorial transmission in that part of space near a lens which is called its "focus." Yet the phenomena of the focus are not explained by any peculiar force common to all "foci" (and so comparable with the agency of "vital force"), but are scientifically accounted for by light and the agencies of media of different densities, through which it is said to be transmitted.

The life of an organism may be compared (*from the physical science point of view*) to the quiet light of a wax candle which seems, to the uninstructed observer, to be the simple action of what he calls "fire," while to the man of science it is a most complicated series of changes, chemical and physical—oxygenation, decomposition, the formation of water, capillary attraction, etc., etc., all of which must be taken together to explain by their diverse simultaneous activities, the apparently simple effect.

But not only is the existence of a diffused "vital force" not demonstrable, and not only do men of science yield to a general tendency of human nature in imaging forth the world's activities generally, in terms of moving matter; but they very properly advocate the use of a means which experience has shown them to be most efficacious for their own legitimate end, which is the progress of physical science. The wonderful discoveries which modern research has made, have been made, not by investigating the ebb and flow of an imaginary "vital force," but by the application to the study of living nature of the previously ascertained laws of chemistry and physics. The discovered laws of the phenomena of digestion, of respiration, of the circulation of the nutritive fluids, etc., are all instances of the successful application of

physics to the investigation of the phenomena of life. To that fruitful source alone we have also to look for the remedies of the physical ills of bodily life, for the perfecting of the trained skill of the physician, as well as, and no less than, that of the more obviously mechanical art of surgery.

Physical science can repose upon and appeal to nothing but things evident to the senses. It is thus compelled to make use of a mechanical imagination of nature, and no blame can therefore attach to physicists who regard this as their *practical* ideal, and attend exclusively to the physical forces, disregarding that discredited figment termed "vital force."

Should we, then, really accept the mechanical theory of the universe as an ABSOLUTE TRUTH? and are we to regard the world of animals and plants as presenting no really *essential* difference from that of the inorganic world?

We are far from thinking men *are* compelled to do this, and we will endeavor briefly to give our reasons why we think men are *not* so compelled.

Physical science is great, but it is not everything; and it cannot, by its very nature, be supreme. It essentially reposes upon our sense-perceptions, but it is not "*sense*," but "*intellect*" which is and *must* be supreme in us. It is not "*sense*," but "*thought*," which tells us that we have sense-perceptions at all, and which criticises them and makes use of them. They are the indispensable servants of our intellect, without them it cannot move a step, but they are none the less its *servants*. Though we can have no imagination, and therefore no thoughts, till our minds are roused to activity by the action of the world about us on our sense-organs; though we can imagine nothing of the elements of which we have not had sensuous experience, nevertheless we gain *through* the ministry of sense that which is *not* sensuous, but which regulates our every thought and rational action. The great principle, called *that of contradiction*, which lies at the root of our intellectual life—the principle that *nothing can, at the same time*, "*be*" *and* "*not be*," may be taken as the type of conceptions which are gained *through* sense, but are not *of* sense.

Reason in man is supreme; and it relates to those first principles which have been recognized by one of our greatest living physicists as "*underlying all physical science*." Great, therefore, as may be the *utility* of a mechanical view of nature, fully justified as men of science are in making use of it, and advocating its use for their own ends, it by no means follows that we should regard this useful working hypothesis as the *very truth!* We should or should not so regard it according as it may appear when viewed,

not in the light of physical science, but in that of philosophy, which is the *judge of physical science*.

Here, then, we may return, for a moment, to the consideration of nature as the arena for the play of forces, whether "physical" or "vital."

It is, as we know, the scientific fashion of the day (and a *practically* useful fashion) to regard the phenomena of living beings as "physical," and to also consider the various physical forces, heat, light, chemical affinity, etc., as so many *modes of motion*.

But when we raise ourselves above the horizon of physical science to the broader outlook of philosophy, can we then regard this practical reduction of all things to "motion" as really an explanation?

We have freely conceded that "vital force" is a figment, but what are we to say of heat, light, and motion also? Are *they* realities?

In fact, they are in *themselves* nothing more than abstractions of the mind. There is no such thing as "heat," or as "motion;" though, of course, there are numberless warm bodies of different temperatures, while as to the quality "moving," nothing, so far as we know, is absolutely at rest. But they are commonly spoken of as if they were *not mere qualities of bodies*, but actual *substances*, which may pass from one body into another and mutually transform themselves. To explain the phenomena of living beings, then, by "mechanical motion," however practically convenient for the investigation of physical science, is, from the point of view of pure reason, a philosophical absurdity. It is an attempt to explain them by a nonentity—a mental abstraction from a certain quality found in things. Moreover, as living creatures make known to us various *different* "qualities," to attempt to explain them all by different *quantities* of *one only quality* is an attempt to extract the category of QUALITY out of the category of QUANTITY, which every one at all versed in philosophy will recognize as a self-evident absurdity.

Please recollect that we are in no way objecting to the use of such conceptions as that of the "transformation of force" for the purpose of aiding calculations and for general advance in physical science; we only object to the incautious use of such language as may lead persons to believe that "forces" are *substances*, or to the notion that such conceptions are really profound truths; as if we really knew physical motion better than we do thought or will.

What essential distinction, then, does there remain to draw between living beings and beings devoid of life? There remains that distinction which was drawn more than two thousand two hundred years ago by the greatest of philosophers, and which has the advantage of agreeing with what common sense tells us to-day.

It is the view that each living being, in addition to possessing those properties of which the senses inform us, also possesses, or rather is, a unifying principle, "*a principle of individuation*" which altogether escapes the cognizance of our senses, though reflective reason agrees with common sense in assuring us that it is by it that an animal concentrates into one mental centre the multitude of impressions made simultaneously and successively upon its various organs of sense.

This view, at once popular and philosophic, has of late years received a remarkable adhesion from one who has been amongst the foremost advocates of a mechanical conception of nature. We refer to the German philosopher, Hermann Lotze, a man free altogether from theological or other prejudices or prepossessions. Moved alone by a profound and patient exercise of his reason, he has come to enunciate in the most uncompromising way that view (so long ago maintained by Aristotle), the existence in each living being of a "Psyche"—a term most difficult to render into our own tongue because of the misleading connotation of the word "soul," which is its nearest English equivalent.

The existence of such an internal principle *in ourselves*, is the most certain object of all knowledge. It is conceivable that we may doubt as to the existence of our body, but it is absolutely impossible to doubt the existence of a something which is actually thinking and feeling, and which recollects more or less of its own past. This knowedge, as to our own nature, enables us to conceive the existence of a principle of individuation in other living beings, though we can never *imagine* such a thing, which, as Lotze says, is as impossible as to know *how things look in the dark*.

The recognition of the existence of this principle, however, is a matter of philosophy, or pure science, and not of mere physical science, which must ignore it, since it cannot rise to its recognition without going beyond its own province, which is nature, as cognizable to us in and by our senses.

Nevertheless, physical science may serve to confirm the teaching of philosophy, inasmuch as the whole tendency of modern researches is to show that living creatures do not arise except from antecedent living creatures and refutes the notion of "spontaneous generation." We have no disinclination to believe in spontaneous generation; we confess, it has been with reluctance that we have found ourselves forced by experimental evidence—especially by the evidence adduced by M. Pasteur, to whom we are all so greatly indebted—to reject all belief in it.

According to our present knowledge, then, a great gulf yawns between the living world and the world devoid of life—a gulf which nothing we can imagine seems capable of bridging over. It is true

that certain physicists think that though spontaneous generation cannot take place *now*, it must have taken place a long while ago; but if asked *why* they think this, they have no reply but that they cannot otherwise imagine how living creatures could have ever come to be! But we have had no experience of creatures "coming to be." No wonder, then, if we cannot imagine it; for we can imagine nothing of which we have not had sensuous experience. The wisest course, I venture to think, is at present to say that physical science affords us no ground for affirming anything one way or another about the mode in which living things came to be, though it affirms the *fact* that all our experience is against the *spontaneous* origin of *living things*.

If this conception, that the essential, intimate nature of living things is something beyond the reach of the senses, commends itself, on reflection, to the reader's reason, he will then see how pregnant with true philosophy, and how essentially sufficient, is the popular, common-sense reply to the question, "What are animals and plants?" namely, the answer that "they *are living things*," in so far as it implies that each has its own principle of individuation and of *spontaneous internal activity*.

Apart, however, from the acceptance of this view, we have seen that the totality of animals and plants form together a single immense group of creatures, possessing the ten characteristics which we have hereinbefore briefly enumerated, namely, that they are more or less rounded, aqueous, protoplasmic bodies, of very uniform chemical composition—breathing, feeding, secreting, and growing by intussusception, according to definite laws, reproducing their kind by a series of cyclical changes, and more or less able to form habits through their internal spontaneity.

Such is our answer to the first question: "What are animals and plants, as contrasted with substances which are neither the one nor the other?" It remains to say a few words as to the second question—that concerning the relations of animals and plants, one to the other.

At first sight nothing could seem more obvious than the distinctness of animals from plants; but a very little science soon shows that to draw a distinction is not so easy a matter. Elaborate and recondite distinctions have been, one after another, drawn out, but these have, one after another, broken down, until there remains no one character which can be at the same time affirmed of all animals and denied of all plants (or *vice versa*), while these two great groups remain such as they are generally taken to be, the creatures known as Protozoa being reckoned as animals; that is, the lowest so-called animals, the bodies of which are not constituted of "*tissues*."

Let us look at these distinctions, beginning with the most obvious:

1. The first of these relates to external form. The predominant branching vegetal form is denoted by the word "*arborescent*," but many species of the animals (allied to the Corals) are arborescent also, while multitudes of the lowest plants are more or less spheroidal, and some are worm-like in figure.

2. Secondly, locomotion is common to almost all animals, but some are permanently fixed, like plants, while certain lower plants, especially in the earlier stages of their existence, are actively locomotive.

3. Animals generally live on more or less solid food, which they take into an internal digestive cavity. All animals, however, do not do this, notably the Entozoa, while certain plants are said to more or less nourish themselves on captured prey, as is the case with Venus's fly-trap and Dionœa (the sun-dew), while others, as the Pitcher plants, can receive them into a cavity, which is, to a certain extent, comparable with the animal alimentary cavity, since that is, morphologically, but an involution of the external surface.

4. Plants generally contain a greater amount of non-nitrogenous material in their composition than do animals generally, but this distinction is of little avail as regards the lowest forms of life of both groups.

5. Plants generally have a less evident power of forming habits or of responding to stimuli by increased activity; but this again does not serve as a distinction as regards the lower plants and animals.

6. Until quite recently it could be said that no animals possess that power of liberating carbonic acid and fixing carbon which is possessed by plants; but now it is known that certain worms also exercise this power. Nevertheless, we may still say that plants generally possess the power of feeding directly on the inorganic world and building up organic matter from it, while the animal kingdom has it not; and this difference constitutes what is sometimes spoken of as "the circulation of the elements."

Until the other day it could have been said that with the exception of a lowly species called *myxomycetes*, all plants were organisms composed of one, few, or many small masses of protoplasm, separated from each other by partitions of a non-nitrogenous substance called "cellulose," while in animals the protoplasmic particles were not so separated. Quite recently, however, it has been found that in some, and probably in very many if not in all plants, protoplasm *is continuous*, passing by minute filaments from cell to cell, through such cellulose partitions.

With the failure of this differential character, the very last distinction between the two kingdoms, *as ordinarily understood*, falls

to the ground. We must profess ourselves utterly unable to frame any definition which shall at the same time include all kinds of one of these two groups, while excluding all kinds of the other group.

Nevertheless, it is obvious that there is an immense difference between animals and plants generally—a difference well expressed by that common-sense assertion we quoted at starting, that "animals are creatures which get their living by the help of their senses, while plants are senseless." Now, this common-sense view accords with the distinction drawn so many centuries ago by Aristotle, that animals feel, while plants do not.

In biology, however, groups are characterized by *structure* rather than by *function*, and we know, moreover, that every difference in "function" has some difference in "structure" as its accompaniment. But what is the structure which is related to the function of "feeling"? It is the *nervous system*. "Nervous tissue" is the "organ of feeling," and modifications of it, with accessory accompaniments, constitute every organ of special sense, *i. e.*, of sight, hearing, smell, taste, and touch.

Now, no plant is yet known to possess anything like nervous tissue, and the same may be affirmed of the lowest organisms commonly recognized as animals. We know at present no way of defining a plant save the negative one of saying "a plant is an organism which is not an animal," while the essence of animal life seems to us to be the power of "feeling," together with its necessary correlation, the "possession of a nervous system." If, then, we must draw a hard and fast line between the two kingdoms, we see no way left for us but that of transferring to the vegetal kingdom those lower organisms generally reckoned as animals, which possess no nervous systems. To botanists they will perhaps be an unwelcome present, but they can hardly be refused on any valid scientific grounds. The activity and irritability of many of them are, no doubt, very suggestive of animal life, but so are the activities of some of the lowest organisms always recognized as plants—many of the Algæ, especially in their younger stages and reproductive parts, together with such curious plants of prey as Venus's fly-trap and its allies—lately referred to.

We do not, indeed, yet positively advocate, though we regard with favor, such a mode of dividing the two component groups which together constitute animated nature; but we confess that we see no possible manner in which these two predominantly diverse groups of organisms can be divided, if the whole mass of living creatures, which we have seen to be so sharply and distinctly separated off from the non-living world, are to be completely, sharply, and distinctly separated, one from the other.

Thus, we venture to think, may at present best be answered the

two questions with which we set out: (1) What animals and plants are, as contrasted with substances which are neither the one nor the other; and, (2) How animals and plants stand towards each other; the answers to which constitute the only reply we know of to the fundamental question we have taken as the title of this paper: "What are Animals and Plants?"

THE ENCYCLICAL "IMMORTALE DEI."

THERE never, perhaps, was a time when clearness of ideas was more demanded among Christian nations than at the present day. Protestantism, which, as its name imports, is a rebellion against God's Church, and, as His Eminence Cardinal Newman has observed, can maintain its position only by asserting that the Church of Rome has gone astray, set up its tribunal of private judgment. That tribunal has called before it every question, religious or moral, with the result of a confusion such that the most ordinary and obvious truths are misapplied, distorted, or rejected, while the most pernicious theories of religion and morality are working havoc among our poor misguided fellow men. It is no wonder this has occurred. At best, as the sacred writer has said: "The thoughts of mortals are timid, and our foresight uncertain" (Wisdom ix., 14). When men deliberately stray away from the fount of living waters, and from the source of truth, they must expect the natural result. Reason, always of its nature liable to err, will then find itself irresistibly driven to conclusions the folly of which will be shown by the practical results. In the midst of the upheaval of society at this epoch, when the masses rise up against legitimate authority, class is arrayed against class, the most sacred duties are disavowed, and the most tender and delicate ties are sundered and the family made desolate, what a blessing to have speak to the world one whose thoughts are not timid, and who, like his Divine Master, gives forth his utterances "as one having authority!" The Encyclical "Immortale Dei," dated All Saints' Day, of the year 1885, is a boon to the world. Not since the Vatican Council has a more important document issued from the pen of the Sovereign Pontiff. Non-Catholics as well as Catholics recognize its truth, its wisdom, its opportuneness, and its eminently practical utility. The liberal press of Vienna was, we

believe, the first to style it "The Covenant between Church and Society." Of course, these journals must have their say, and they, therefore, here and there make their reservations; but those reservations are made lest their expressions of admiration should lead their readers to infer they were about to surrender to the Pope. The London *Tablet* has published a number of extracts from the newspapers of the Continent to show in what esteem the Encyclical is held by those opposed to the Church. As is to be expected, the journals edited by those not of the faith make objection according to their peculiar opinions; but it would be an interesting work to show how, while they do this, the greater number would be found on the side of nearly if not every teaching of the Encyclical. The reason is obvious when we come to review briefly the document in detail.

In a style classic and easy to understand, even by those not used to theological treatment of religious or moral questions, our most Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII., comes to the aid of society, and lays down the Catholic doctrine of social life familiar to a Catholic ear, but having a strange sound to the world which habitually refuses a hearing to the Catholic side. The commanding position of the Sovereign Pontiff, however, compels attention, while his personal worth exacts homage even from the proudest men of culture. The effect, therefore, of this Encyclical is apt to be very far-reaching, and it would be a panacea of social ill, were it not that too many of the class Holy Writ tells of, *nolunt intelligere ut bene agant*, do not wish to understand, because they do not want to do what is right.

The first point the Pope speaks of is civil society and authority. We feel it is a pity to curtail these extracts, but the limits of a short article do not permit anything else. In his preamble he says: "No more excellent a manner of establishing and governing a State has been found than that which of its own accord springs from the teaching of the Gospel." How true! Christian charity is the true political economy. The laws of commerce, demand and supply, increase, population, poverty and wealth, would all be the more solid and less liable to error or variation were charity their basis; while the stability of the State founded on the Christian idea of authority would guarantee also the firmness of law of whatever nature.

Authority, the Pope tells us, is from God. Listen to his words: "It is in the very nature of man that he live in society, since he cannot obtain in solitude the necessary culture and ornament of life, and likewise perfection of mind and soul, it has been divinely provided that he should be born for the society and intercourse of men, as well domestic as civil, which alone can supply

the perfect sufficiency of life. Inasmuch, however, as no society can exist unless there be some one to preside over the rest, moving each one by an efficacious and like impulse to the common end, it results that authority by which the civil community of men is governed is necessary; which not otherwise than society itself comes from nature and, therefore, from God. From this it follows that public authority in itself is only from God. God alone is the most true and greatest Lord of all, to whom everything that is belongs, and whom all must serve, so that whoever have the right to command receive it from no other source but from God, the sovereign Prince of all." "There is no authority save from God." How wonderfully clear and logical all this is! What dignity it gives to human society and government! How it safeguards authority, and puts an obligation on every human being to obey the law! The whole of this part of the Encyclical is replete with wisdom, and condenses in a most cogent manner the sayings of the wisest and best men of Christianity. The Pope declares that no special form of government is essential, but that may be taken which fitly secures the common utility and welfare. This, be it understood, must be done with order and with no violation of right. The Pope is no partisan of revolution. He says that those exercising authority must act as the ministers of God, and with paternal charity; to act otherwise is to be a tyrant, for authority is for the common good, and not for the personal benefit of the ruler. On the other hand, those subject to authority must obey. These are his words: "To despise legitimate authority, in whatsoever person it be, is no more allowable than to resist the will of God;" which, if any resist, they go to ruin of their own choosing: "Whoso resists authority, resists the ordination of God; those who resist purchase to themselves damnation" (Romans xiii., v. 2). This official teaching of the Pope is a pledge to our country of the good which will come to it from the Catholic Church. We have the republican form of government, established in a proper orderly manner, and as Dr. J. Gilmary Shea has ably shown, by the cordial and unanimous coöperation of Catholics, from the soldiers of "Congress' Own" to the distinguished signer of the Declaration of Independence, Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, and his venerable relative, afterwards the first Archbishop of Baltimore. Every Catholic, the Pope declares, must obey that government. As a consequence the Catholic Church will be found to be the most effective bulwark of American freedom, and of individual rights. Nor need our good fellow-countrymen, bred up in the false ideas of their various creeds, in dread and dislike of Catholicity, fear encroachments on their rights of conscience; for further on the Sovereign Pontiff not only states that princes can tolerate in their

dominions, for just reasons, a difference of faith, but also asserts that the Church is wont to see that no one be compelled to believe against his will, quoting St. Augustine, when he says: "No one can believe except by an act of his will." This act of the will we know is an elicited act, and cannot be forced; otherwise a man would will and not will at the same time the same thing, which is absurd. As for just reasons to tolerate difference of opinion on matters of faith, surely no juster reasons can exist than here among us, where those who differ with us do so in the best of good faith. They will always find us good neighbors and friends, and loyal to the words of the Holy Father which we have just cited. But while the Pope speaks thus with Christian charity, that same Christian charity makes him condemn in outspoken language, for which we are sincerely grateful to him, the doctrine that the choice of one's religion is a matter of indifference; that the various creeds are on an equal footing, and equally safe. He proclaims that only one is the true and safe one, that of the Holy Roman and Apostolic Church; that all are bound to seek in it the means of salvation, and, therefore, to respect and cherish it.

Passing from the consideration of authority in the State and in the Church, and of the good that comes from their mutual good feeling and agreement, the Pope comes to the serious question of revolution as advocated by the secret societies of the present day, and condemns it as it has always been condemned by the Church. And here let us remark, that the secret organization of Masonry, the chief expounder and actor in the propagation of revolutionary ideas in Europe, is entirely out of place in this country and unpatriotic, a menace to our institutions if it were to succeed in spreading its doctrines among us. Americans do not need any dark-lantern work. Let the children of darkness go whence they came, to their place of birth in Europe; they are out of place here. We want education and light, the more the better, not the education which Freemasonry gives without God, but the truth which comes from God, whose light illumes it through the fostering care of His Church. The Head of that Church speaks in unmistakable terms of revolutionary principles. He quotes the documents on this subject given to the world by his predecessors, confirms them, and then sums up. "From these prescriptions of the Pontiffs the following are to be by all means understood: that the origin of public power is to be sought in God Himself, and not in the multitude or people; that the license of sedition (revolution) is repugnant to reason; that it is wrong in men, and wrong in States, to give no place to the duties of religion, or to look on all religions in the same manner; that immoderate power to think and publish one's thoughts is not the right of any citizen, nor is it to be classed

among those things that merit favor and patronage. In like manner it must be understood that the Church is a society, not less than the State itself, perfect in kind and right."

We have referred sufficiently to the first two points of this last passage. The remainder of this article will refer to what the Pope says about the Church in its relation to the State. Once grant that the Church as well as the State is from God; that the Church has her authority directly from God, given to the Apostles and their successors, so that those who hear them hear Him, that this authority is abiding in the Church now as on the Day of Pentecost, and no sane man can avoid seeing that both these societies, the State and the Church, are independent, the one of the other, each in its sphere; but that the State which is constituted for the material order must be second and subordinate to the Church in what relates to the spiritual condition of men, for which Christ constituted the Church. So evident is this that the "Reformers," who found they had to depend on the Rulers of the States they were in, invented a hitherto strange doctrine, that religion belonged to the one who ruled the land, *cujus regio illius religio.* Professor Schaff, in a recent article in the *North American Review*, deservedly and unmercifully scores the slavish condescension of these men who pretended to preach liberty of opinion. They not only made man the slave of kingly power, but enslaved his soul too! And so while the iron heel of the European despotism was stamping out the true faith of Christ from the hearts of poor simple people, the minister stood by and applauded, and bade the people accept what the Prince said they must believe. Degradation of humanity! Was this the conduct of the Popes, and bishops, and priests, and martyrs of the early Christian centuries? No! They gave the people the example of dying for the faith, and bade them die for it. They followed the example of the Apostles, who said: "We ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts v., 29). In this Encyclical the Pope lays down the law given by Christ: "Give unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; but to God the things that are God's." There is no fear of the Church trying to usurp the rights of the State. History shows that the danger is just the other way. The calumny of her enemies has blackened the fair fame of Christ's spouse, who must always defend His interests, and bear the consequences, persecution and calumny. That many questions arise in which the two orders, the civil and religious, meet, comes necessarily from the fact that man has a soul, first subject to God, and then to the State. Those questions, as the Pope ably intimates, can be met by agreements which accurately determine the relations of each order, known as Concordats. Where these are observed, there is no danger of any clash. That such agreements will be needed in this country, where the Church enjoys

the fullest liberty, is not at all likely. It is far more likely that the State, in the possible troubles which may result from the too unrestricted importation of the refuse of Europe, and extension of the right of suffrage, may have to call on the Church to keep her simple people from the delusions of socialism abroad in the land, brought hither by those who learned such principles in the countries that have cast off the "yoke of Rome," or turned a deaf ear to the counsels of the Church. It is such doctrines as these, atheistical literature eminently destructive of society, and such publications as Mr. Comstock so meritoriously wars against, which make Pope Leo XIII. condemn the unbridled liberty of the pen, and society should thank Him for what he has done.

WHAT CAN BE DONE FOR THE ORPHANS?

FROM the earliest organization of Catholic churches in this country, the orphans have been a constant charge, in whose behalf no elaborate appeal has ever been needed. The cause of the fatherless has pleaded eloquently for itself to the benevolence of our people, and no contributions are given so heartily and so ungrudgingly as those made for the preservation of the life and the faith of the little ones whom death has deprived of parents to watch over and guide them.

Beside the efforts made by the parochial clergy and the religious connected with schools to find homes for children reduced to the condition of orphans, efforts by which large numbers are taken into charitable families and cared for, provision is made by the Catholic community to erect and maintain orphan asylums where these helpless children can be received, kept and educated so as to fit them for obtaining a livelihood when they are placed out, and at the same time so grounded in the faith of their parents that perseverance may be anticipated.

Such asylums are found in all our large cities, and scattered through the country, generally at the cathedral cities. The whole number of inmates of the Catholic orphan asylums in the United States seems to be about twenty thousand, although complete returns are not given from all parts; the great cities of Albany, Brooklyn, New York, New Orleans, Philadelphia, and San Fran-

cisco alone maintaining nearly half that number. Exclusive of the money expended in the purchase of land and the erection of the requisite buildings, which in many cases were effected by our forefathers in the faith, the annual amount raised for the support of the orphan asylums by the Catholic body must be something like a million and a half of dollars.

The question of the best means of caring for this large body of helpless ones whom Providence has committed to our trust, and fitting them to earn their own support hereafter, so as to grow up creditably to their faith and their country, is one of no small moment; but it has not apparently been studied in all its aspects or treated as a whole by any one in authority.

In old communities where there is little change, as in Catholic Canada, the general sympathy for children left orphans leads to their being adopted by some of the kind-hearted neighbors who knew the parents; and there orphan asylums are scarcely known. Even in cases of epidemics, where numbers of orphans are at once thrown on the charity of the faithful at large, as at Montreal after the ship fever, no asylum was needed, although the orphans and their parents were strangers just landed in the country. At a single appeal from the late venerable Archbishop Bourget every orphan was received and cared for.

With our constantly changing and moving population in most parts of the United States, such a system of adoption is impossible as a general practice, although there is scarcely a parish where this is not done to a greater or less extent. Orphan asylums are generally diocesan institutions, and seldom have accommodations or resources to enable them to receive all who apply. There is sometimes considerable delay when it is undertaken to place an orphan in an asylum, and the clergyman who seeks to obtain admission for the child of deceased members of his parish often finds it easier to secure them a home among his own people, and under his own eye, than to await the action of a distant Board. But this cannot always be done.

Asylums are therefore necessary, and their number increases steadily. There is rarely a case where an asylum has been opened and been abandoned for want of orphans to be received, or of support from the generous sympathy of the Catholic public. The asylums for Catholic orphans in this country are conducted by religious, and therefore at a minimum expense compared to those with paid superintendents, matrons, assistants, and the like. A small number of boys' asylums are under the care of Brothers of the Christian Schools or other similar congregations; but most of the asylums are conducted by Sisters, the Sisters of Charity being con-

spicuous, as they were the first to undertake this charitable work in our country.

In the immigrant population, diseases acquired on shipboard or resulting from the change of diet, climate, and mode of living, as well as those entailed as a penalty for indiscretion or dissipation, carry off many adults, leaving their families helpless. Where children are born here, the same causes very often make them weakly in constitution, with a tendency to disease. Overwork in the parents in their early struggles often leaves its history in their early death and in feeble children. These classes contribute largely in their proportion of orphans, and those presented for admission to asylums are consequently cases that no life insurance company would regard as good risks. The orphans are therefore more liable than a similar number of children taken at random from the community to a variety of diseases and infirmities. They are generally children of parents weakened in constitution and short in tenure of life. Contagious diseases are apt to spread among them, and, when they once acquire entrance, are difficult to banish from such establishments. Other causes also tend to perpetuate rather than overcome weakness. The order and system maintained gives the inmates less opportunity for exercise and the hardening of the constitution by outdoor employment or amusement that the children would have enjoyed if their parents had lived. Secluded from the world, not even mingling with other children at school, or on the errands on which the children of the poor are constantly sent, these orphans, tenderly cared for and watched over, grow up simple, unsuspicious, ignorant of the world and of the ordinary affairs of life. It is not easy even to give them the ideas of homework that would be acquired by children brought up in the strictest home seclusion. They are thus necessarily inclined to be less robust in body, and liable to be beguiled when they pass from the care of the good Sisters and are exposed to the temptations of the world.

From time to time, as they grow up, orphans are bound out, or placed out, for the old system of apprenticeship is virtually extinct in this country. Then their connection with the asylum virtually ends. The good Sisters are taken up with new-comers; the parishes from which the orphans came have lost sight of them; the associations, often more nominal than real, which manage asylum affairs, assume no further care. Even where attempt is made to follow them up for a time, all trace is soon lost. What becomes of the orphans? There is no place to which they can turn as a home, no place for counsel, sympathy or protection; the asylum cannot take them in again, the Sisters may compassionate many a case and make some exertion, but as a member of a community a Sister

cannot act independently, and can rarely enter into the difficulties of particular cases.

As the average stay of an orphan in an asylum is apparently about six years, every time that term ends twenty thousand Catholic orphans pass out of the asylums into the great busy world, virtually lost sight of by the great-hearted Catholic soul of our people. It does seem that some intermediate institution between the asylum and the world is needed to fit them more practically for the life on which they must enter, and to be a refuge from the world in case of necessity.

In New York city this want has been felt, and an establishment has been founded at some distance from the city where, under the charge of Brothers of the Christian Schools, orphan boys who show an aptitude for any kind of mechanical work learn trades or are instructed practically in farm work so as to fit them to succeed either as mechanics or farmers. The results of the experiment have thus far proved satisfactory, and the boys having acquired some practical knowledge are, of course, more readily taken by employers. This prepares them, indeed, for this one avenue in the future, but does not meet all the cases that occur, or even the majority of them.

As business is now carried on, few mechanics take apprentices, or are permitted by trades' unions to take any, and very few boys or girls are inclined to bind themselves to learn any trade. The factories offer a market for less skilled labor, and quicker returns in wages ; boys and girls in great numbers seek employment in them in preference to the slow method of learning a trade. In our large cities at night-fall girls and boys, from the age of twelve years upward, are seen pouring out of tall buildings where manufacturing of various kinds is carried on. The orphan placed at service or to learn a trade sees those of like age thus employed, and eagerly longs to adopt the same course. The temptation is strong, and they easily drift into it, leaving of course the person with whom they had been placed, either surreptitiously or in anger, under either alternative giving no clue by which to trace their future doings. After getting employment they find a boarding-house where they can, and are without any kindly oversight or control.

It is for these, especially the girls, that it seems some species of Home ought to be provided. An establishment under a firm but gentle superintendent to maintain order and system, that would afford board and lodging for the orphans, aid them to obtain employment, advise them as to associates, the proper expenditure of their wages, encourage economy, and check extravagance, would undoubtedly save hundreds. A love of their religion and fidelity in its practice could be more easily kept up. Those awaiting em-

ployment might take part in some kind of work, which would help to pay for their temporary board. The charity of Catholics would be called upon to pay only the expense of the management, and that incurred for those orphans who were received in sickness or in distress. A list of those who year by year leave each Catholic asylum and are transmitted to the Home would help to identify any one applying for admission and save the institution from imposition. The orphans going out into the world would thus feel that they had a home.

Some Catholic may yet introduce a species of charity common in Southern Europe, but as yet unknown here, and that is the practice of establishing a fund, the income of which is given each year as dowries to girls about to marry who can show the best record for industry, virtuous life, and faithful discharge of religious duties. Such a fund for our orphan girls would be a most happy thought, whether connected with an asylum or such a Home as is here suggested.

One of the greatest practical experiments with orphans was that carried out by the present Cardinal Lavigerie soon after he became Bishop of Algiers. Pestilence had swept away thousands of Arabs, and the place was full of orphans. Bishop Lavigerie adopted several hundred of these unfortunate children. He secured a tract of fertile land and placed the children, according to sex, under communities of Brothers and Sisters. As the children grew up they were taught farm work, and some trade, practiced in the country, especially those required in country parts. As they came of age these orphans were encouraged to intermarry, and each young orphan couple received lands, larger for farming and grazing, smaller where the young fellow had a trade, and required only a garden plot and fruit trees. In this way a village of Christian Arabs has been established, entirely free from Mohammedan associations, self supporting, thriving, religious, and happy. The case is one deserving of study, as its lessons may be put in practice in regard to orphans, or to Indian children.

The scheme of Catholic colonization which, under the energetic impulse of Bishops Ireland, O'Connor, Spalding, and others, has attained such magnitude, offers another solution to the question of the best means of advancing the interests of orphan children. As a general rule, an orphan child will do better in a family than in an asylum, except in its earliest years. Now, in these Catholic colonies, boys and girls will not be a burthen, but a needed help, where it is almost impossible to obtain—and what is more, to retain—persons for menial or rural work, either girls for household duties or men for farming labor. If colonies were formed with a direct view to the employment of orphans, it would be well indeed; but it does

not seem that any such step is needed. As these colonies actually are, the Catholic farmers would, doubtless, be only too happy to receive girls who could be trained to household work, who would learn to cook, wash, milk, churn, tend the poultry, and act as nurses to younger children; and boys to aid in all the chores of the house and farm till they could follow the plough and manage horses. These children, being under the eye of the pastor of the settlement, would attend the parochial and Sunday school, and be saved from all temptations against their faith. Their knowledge of the country and the mode of obtaining a livelihood would stand them in stead, and on coming of age they would be prepared to take up lands for themselves, and be able to manage them. Where they were taken into the houses of those who practiced any trade, they would become similarly fitted. Boys showing a readiness at figures and writing would make their way to clerkships, and develop the qualities of business men. The Catholic colonist and the orphan would alike be gainers.

Acting, too, on the plan of the Boland farm, it may be wise to establish a Boys' Asylum near some large city, with competent men to instruct the orphans in market gardening. This is an industry which no Americans seem inclined to undertake, but to which many Germans, Hollanders, and Belgians are thoroughly trained. Their market gardens are found near all large cities on the Atlantic coast, at least from Portland to St. Augustine. Success depends on constant care of each crop of vegetables, and the employment of means to insure the earliest possible vegetables for the market, at, of course, prices much higher than can be obtained when the full crop arrives. An asylum where the boys could be thus trained would have the advantage of being able to furnish a large number to gather small fruits for market. Boys thus trained would always be sure to gain a livelihood, for the competition hitherto has been very slight in this department of industry.

Nor does any reason suggest itself why a Sisterhood should not undertake the cultivation of flowers on a large scale, with extensive greenhouses, training orphan girls to the business. The demand for flowers increases steadily, and the amount of money expended every year in flowers for decoration at festivals, balls, private parties, weddings, funerals, the adornment of churches, and the like, amounts to millions. A convent even of cloistered nuns might well have gardens and conservatories of fine and desirable flowers. There is nothing in the culture and care of flowers that seems incongruous with their secluded and pious life. Still less could any one object to orphan girls being trained under Sisters to this branch of industry. It would enable many girls afterwards to

support themselves, either as cultivators of flowers, as dealers, or in positions where the care of conservatories was required.

With the establishment of homes or training institutions might easily be connected an organization by which reports as to the orphans, or many of them, could be regularly obtained, so that the necessary aid or protection could be extended to them in case of necessity.

In some of the present asylums, not only orphans, properly so called, that is, children deprived by death of both parents, are received, but also children who have one parent living. There are cases where a man losing his wife and compelled to go out to his work cannot possibly look after his children, and must place them in an asylum ; as there are widows who cannot carry their children to the place where they work, nor leave them safely. Yet there are cases where the parent will struggle on bravely rather than be separated from the children. Such parents should always be encouraged and aided; for all conversant with the management of asylums know that in a large number of applications by young widows, there is really a lack of parental affection, and that they wish to rid themselves of a burden in order to marry again. They contribute a little for a time and then cease all payment, often disappearing entirely. To receive the children of such heartless mothers is really aiding them to extinguish all maternal instincts and all Christian principles in their hearts. There are cases given where the fact of one parent surviving is concealed and a child placed by misrepresentation in an asylum as an orphan.

The whole subject of half orphans deserves a special study and treatment; but though objects of charity, their condition differs so essentially from that of orphans, that they ought never be allowed to exclude the latter from an asylum, or be received when real orphans are applicants. In their case the closest relations should be kept up between the surviving parent and the child, so as to keep alive the natural bond of attachment; and as soon as the parent can take the child back and give it a home, the parent should be urged to do so. This duty should be constantly kept before the mind of the widowed parent.

The increase in the cost of maintaining orphans in asylums in or near large cities is such that their removal will soon apparently become a necessity, only employment homes being maintained there. This may arise in part from the wish to give these establishments all the modern improvements, and abandon the simpler ways of former days. But in that case we fall into the error of State governments which spend millions on a lunatic asylum, and erect a palace, men being lunatic enough to make such a refuge, though many of those who are to enter it will be farm laborers. The orphans pass to the asylum from an atmosphere of privation and want, to which they

must eventually return, and the asylum life should not be such as to make them on leaving its walls look even to vice as a means of escaping their old surroundings. In 1843 St. Mary's Female Orphan Asylum, Baltimore, maintained 55 orphans at a cost of $1784.37, or $32.44 each; in 1884 St. Vincent's Male Orphan Asylum, in that city, maintained 42 orphans, at a cost of $3373.96, or $80.33 each. In 1843 the asylum at Mobile maintained its orphans at a cost of $39.85 for each one; in 1884 the cost of maintaining an orphan in New York city averaged $84.37. The cost of supporting orphans has thus, it would seem, doubled in forty years. The cost of an establishment is, in addition, all the greater as the number of inmates is smaller. Hence it may soon be a question whether an experiment in some of the rising Western States, on the plan of that made by Cardinal Lavigerie in Algeria, may not be wisely undertaken by several dioceses in concert, and the orphans transferred from the overcrowded East to the labor-demanding West, where, as soon as these wards of the Church are prepared spiritually, mentally, and physically for their life work, they will find a ready field for their exertion. The money contributed by the charity of the faithful will benefit a greater number, the children will gain in strength and in being isolated from the dangers and temptations of large cities, and the asylum from which they emanate will be always nearer to them than now, when many are sent thousands of miles away from the institutions where they have been nurtured. The asylum then would be a refuge or home in case of need.

We have nowhere spoken of orphans as a burthen on the Catholic community. That they must never be regarded; whether they are children of the poor and ignorant, or the children of those who possessed greater culture and moved in a higher sphere of life, where they appeal to us, it is as the wards of the Church, the special trust confided to us by God, to whom we are to minister of the goods whereof He has made us stewards. Perhaps of the two classes, the children of those whose lives have always been a struggle, a precarious battle for livelihood, is less touching than that of the genteel orphans, who shrink from the idea of an asylum, who seem entitled to retain the social place of their lost parents, but who are too sensitive to make known their condition, who tremble at the harsh repulse they fear they may experience from some one silly enough to regard the money in his hands as really his own and not God's, to be used as God wills. Even while writing these lines our interest has been awakened in such a case, two bright, talented girls, daughters of parents both of whom made a name in the field of literature, grandchildren of one whose name was a power. A convent opens its doors to them, as convents often do in similar cases. Catholic charity will, we trust, do the rest.

THE PRESENT AND FUTURE OF THE IRISH QUESTION.

THE result of the late elections for the British Parliament has fully justified the policy of the Irish National Party since the beginning of Mr. Parnell's leadership. It is little over ten years since the present leader of the Irish people first appeared on the scene of politics, and enunciated the line of action on which he held the long struggle of his country for self-government could be brought to a successful issue. The Home Rule party, under the guidance of the late Isaac Butt, had already taken up the task of agitating in Parliament in favor of the universal demand of the Irish people for the management of their own affairs, but to Mr. Parnell and his colleague, Mr. Biggar, must be really ascribed the system of active and fearless parliamentary warfare for that end. With a lawyer's instinct, Mr. Butt dreaded the power of Parliament, while he hoped to awaken its sympathies by respectful pleas for his downtrodden race, and he sharply condemned the rashness of his young follower who threw himself into open hostility with both English parties. Charles Stewart Parnell realized that it was only by a desperate struggle, and at the risk of life and liberty to its champions, that Ireland could win back the self-government which had been wrested from her by force and fraud, and he also realized that such a struggle could be made as well in the halls of a legislature as on the field of battle. Simple as that fact may now appear, it was scarcely apprehended either in Ireland or in England ten years ago. The more enthusiastic and passionate part of the Irish population, especially the young men, could see no salvation for their country save in an appeal to arms, which reflection showed to be, for the time, utterly hopeless on the part of an unorganized and divided population, almost wholly deprived of the use of arms common to every other nation of the civilized world. The more timid part of the population, realizing the latter fact, saw no hope of terminating the system of rule which was rapidly turning their country to a desert, and were ready to despair of the future. The famous obstruction policy of Parnell and his few colleagues, during the debates on the seizure of the Transvaal, first brought home to both the English and Irish people that, in parliamentary as in military operations, a guerilla warfare may break down an enemy of far superior strength. The Irish people began to realize that a minority need not accept the verdict of a hostile majority in meek silence, and that courage, discipline, in-

telligence and hard work on the part of its representatives had a fair chance of winning the object of their desires even against seemingly overwhelming odds in point of numbers. A majority of Home Rule members was elected in 1880, but more than a third of them lacked either courage or honesty to carry out the programme of Mr. Parnell, and thus, for five long years, he was left to carry on the struggle, with little over thirty followers, against the two great English parties, backed by the whole force of public opinion in Great Britain. How effectually he fought it out, the overthrow of the Gladstone government, with its solid majority of over a hundred, is the best proof, and to-day he is about to open a new campaign, with the full force of an almost solid Irish representation, against two parties so balanced that neither can hold the reins of government in the British Empire against his will.

It would be folly to assume that what has been already done means the immediate concession of Irish self-government. That will have to be fought for through many a weary day, in all human likelihood, but it is much that the Irish forces are actually engaged in a campaign for national independence, with a fair prospect of success. The public opinion of the English people is strongly opposed to any concession of self-government to Ireland, and it is only by the most consummate skill that a minority of eighty-six, in an assembly of six hundred and seventy, can hope to make an unpopular cause victorious. Could it be carried out, the suggestion recently made by the London *Times* for settling the Irish difficulty by expelling all Nationalist members of Parliament and putting Ireland under martial law, would be readily adopted by the majority of the English voters of both parties. The utterances of Mr. Chamberlain, the leader of the English Radicals, and those of Lord Salisbury, the Conservative Prime Minister, prove that the feeling against Irish self-government is equally distasteful to Englishmen of the most opposite shades of opinion. To place confidence in the sympathies of any English party would be worse than childish on the part of an Irish statesman. Their fears and interests may bring them to consent to the emancipation of Ireland, but not their sentiments or sympathies. The title of "the huckster nation," applied by Napoleon to the English people, is essentially correct as applied to their public policy to-day. It is only by long and patient efforts that any important concession can be wrung from the British Government. Any concession will be made in the smallest proportions possible to attain its end, and the Irish people must be prepared for a long and bitter struggle during the coming year, before an Irish Parliament can be seen again in Dublin.

Before predicting the probable result of the contest which is sure

to occupy the British Parliament during its pending session, it is all-important to form an accurate idea of what amount of national independence is necessarily included in the idea of Irish Home Rule. With consummate skill, the leader of the Irish people has declined to present any detailed statement of the Irish requirements to the English people. To do so, at the present moment, would simply be to afford an opportunity for English prejudice to commit itself to a determined opposition, before the numerous questions involved can be tried on their merits in Parliament. It would be easy to raise a general cry in England sufficiently loud to scare both parties on the question of Irish independence, while, on the other hand, the various powers, which would make Ireland a self-governing nation, may be, each, accepted in detail. The Irish question, to-day, is a difficulty for English politicians which may, at any moment, become a serious danger, and it is for their interest, not less than Ireland's, to solve it satisfactorily. The Irish people have, again and again, brought forward plans for its solution. O'Connell's Repeal of the Union and Butt's Home Rule programme were both contemptuously rejected, and Mr. Parnell has no mind to undertake the task tried unsuccessfully by his predecessors. He prefers to leave to English ministers to find for themselves what is the nature of the self-government that will satisfy the Irish people, and when they have formed their plan, he will be ready to amend it. The aspiration of the overwhelming mass of the Irish people for emancipation from the form of government now imposed on them is notorious. To get rid of it, they would willingly overthrow the British Empire, if they had the power, and, in the vicissitudes of human affairs, the power may come to them.

> "The patient watch and vigil long
> Of him who treasures up a wrong,"

are as dangerous to States as to individuals, and the rulers of the British Empire have good reason, in the present state of the empire, to remove the active feeling of hostility, on the part of the whole Irish race, which now exists. But according to the usual course of English policy, the smallest possible amount of concession will at first be proposed, and in haggling over its terms an immense amount of time will inevitably be consumed. The amount of self-government which alone can satisfy the Irish people is really fixed by the nature of things itself, but it will need long debate to convince the majority of Englishmen that it is not solely dependent on their own good pleasure.

It must be borne in mind, also, that English opinion is not the only factor that requires conciliation in settling the relations between England and Ireland on an amicable basis without a com-

plete rupture of the British Empire. As an abstract question, the great majority of the Irish race would, we believe, prefer a total separation of their destinies from those of Great Britain to any other settlement. The memories of seven centuries of warfare and oppression have burned themselves into the minds of the Irish race, and have made them bitterly hostile to the very name of England. The fact may be regretted, but it cannot be denied. It will need the experience of years of really good government to convince the majority of Irishmen that the connection of their country with England is in any way desirable for them. This is, indeed, a sentiment; but national sentiments are not less of a political force than material resources. In the present century the national sentiment of Spain proved a more terrible foe to Napoleon than the armies and organization of all the great military powers of Europe. A change in the existing sentiments of the Irish race is requisite for a solution of the Irish question in English politics. And such a change can only be effected by establishing a government in Ireland that will satisfy the practical wants and the national self-respect of the Irish people.

The problem of reconciling the practical independence of Ireland with the integrity of the British Empire is thus beset with difficulties on both sides; but though difficult, its solution is not impossible. The civilized world presents numerous examples of different nationalities united under a strong central government, and yet preserving the control of their own affairs in accord with the bent of their national character.

Hungary, Bohemia, and Galicia are united under the sovereignty of the German House of Hapsburg, while each preserves its distinctive institutions, its parliament, and its language apart. Sweden and Norway, with different traditions and constitution, form one power under one sovereign, as far as the rest of the world is concerned. Bavaria, Saxony, and Wurtemberg retain their national laws and native sovereigns in the great military power of the German Empire. In the British Empire itself, Canada and the Australian colonies possess nearly all the attributes of independent States, regulating their whole internal policy in accordance with their own needs and desires. Such an independence as is enjoyed by any of these would, we believe, satisfy the national aspirations of the Irish people, and such an independence would in no way destroy the unity of the British Empire, as far as the world outside is concerned, or prevent the English people from exercising the full control of their own destinies.

The great obstacle to the concession of such an autonomy to Ireland is, of course, the greed of power on the part of the English people and Parliament. The practical gain drawn from Ireland as

a dependency of England, though large, is daily decreasing with the progressive impoverishment of the country, and is, besides, counterbalanced by the necessarily wasteful expenditure required to keep the population in subjection. The desire to keep Ireland weak through fear of possible rivalry, either in trade or in war, is, no doubt, strong among a large section of the English people, but it is not a motive which is very openly avowed. The cry that the integrity of the Empire would be ruined by the concession of Irish Home Rule, is the strongest argument against the latter with the English masses, both in Parliament and outside it. This, too, is, in its way, a national sentiment, but, as a matter of history, the English people has always shown itself much less tenacious of sentiments than of material interests. The latter are not, we believe, very seriously, if at all, involved in the question of Irish Home Rule, and for this reason we believe that its concession is quite within the range of practical politics, provided the forces of the Irish people are steadily directed to that end. The weapon which recent events have placed in the hands of the Irish leader is an eminently practical one. It is the control of the patronage of the Imperial Government which, if he cannot give to his friends, he can take away from whichever party shows itself hostile to the cause he represents. Before such a consideration we are justified in thinking that the politicians of Great Britain will find a means for dispensing with sentimental reasons even stronger than those which confound the safety of the empire with the establishment of self-government in Ireland.

What the essential parts of such a system of Home Rule as will satisfy Irish demands without conflicting with the real interests of England are, may easily be pointed out. The laws regulating the conduct of life, the possession of property, the education of the people, the development of the resources of the country, and, in a word, all the strictly internal management of the affairs of the Irish people in their own country, must be both made and administered by the free will of the Irish people. The well-being of that people must be the main end of its institutions as far as its own intelligence and public virtue can direct them. That it will always direct them to that end in the best possible manner would be to expect too much from human nature. Every government and every people is liable to errors and wrongs in its policy, but it is essential to any genuine self-government of a people that in its own sphere it shall be supreme. Our own system furnishes ample illustration of this fact. A State may run heedlessly into debt, may elect incompetent officials, may pass injudicious laws, yet the central government has no power to check its course while it does not trench on the general Constitution. So it must be in any system that can have a fair

chance of meeting the requirements of the Irish people. They must be left to make their own laws and take the consequences of them untrammelled by any interference, however well meant on the part of the Imperial Parliament. To establish an Irish Parliament, and then require its acts to be ratified by the Imperial assembly, would be simply to perpetuate the present condition of things under a new name. It would be to continue the effort to govern Ireland in accordance with English ideas and English wishes, and that is precisely the system which has been in force during the whole of this century and the failure of which is the reason for granting independent Home Rule.

Several of the suggestions which have been put forward lately by English public men indicate the difficulties which will be raised on this subject. It has been alleged that the existing laws should be maintained in force in Ireland when it is allowed its own legislature, as if a legislature could be such without the power of making or changing laws imposed on it. Again, it is urged that the rights of property must be maintained according to English ideas, by which, it may be presumed, is meant that no legislation should be allowed to regulate the relations between landlord and tenant in Ireland on any pretext, though it is admitted that the present state of things is ruinous and cannot be maintained. A third brilliant requirement is that freedom of conscience should be placed under the supervision of the Imperial Parliament, lest, we presume, Mr. Parnell and his co-religionists should be treated as England treated her Catholic subjects down to 1829. Each of these suggestions carries with it its own refutation. Without making a single change in the existing land law, the official valuers, if appointed by the Irish people, could reduce the rental of the whole country to its prairie value by allowing the tenants the value of their own improvements and those of their predecessors in title. Even as it is, the English Parliament finds itself powerless to obtain for Irish landlords rents which the land does not yield, and an Irish Parliament, even if it had the will, would be equally powerless. To establish an Irish Parliament for the redress of Irish grievances, coupled with a strict prohibition to meddle with the same, would seem a folly too gross for belief, yet it has been publicly put forward in the English Press. The fact shows the necessity of insisting on the absolute independence of the Irish Parliament in all matters relating to Irish internal affairs, if it is not to be the veriest shadow of a dream.

The control of the police force is another power which it has been seriously suggested by English statesmen should be reserved to the Imperial Parliament. The absurdity involved in granting the Irish people the right to make their own laws and judges, but re-

fusing them control of the constables employed to carry out the orders of these same judges, does not seem to have occurred to the British public, for the changes have been since repeatedly rung on the police question. In reality the Irish Constabulary system, like the Irish land system, is one of the branches of administration which most urgently require a complete reformation in Ireland, if the public feeling is to be brought into sympathy with the government. Founded on a plan unknown either in England or America, the Irish Constabulary is rather an army of occupation maintained in the interests of the landlord and official classes than a police force. It numbers twelve thousand men drilled in military fashion, and commanded by a staff of officers, under the names of inspectors and sub-inspectors, independent both of the local authorities and of the judiciary, and receiving orders from an Inspector-General in Dublin Castle. The officers are drawn almost exclusively from the anti-national classes, as any manifestation of sympathy with national feelings is regarded by the authorities as a sign of insubordination, and would lead to reprimand or dismissal, as has been shown on more than one occasion. A special precaution to confine the selection of officers to a particular class requires that on their entrance to the force a guarantee must be given by some member of the cadet's family for the payment to him of a private revenue in addition to his pay during an indefinite time. The nomination of candidates is entirely at the discretion of the Lord Lieutenant, and Freemasonry is believed to enter largely into the promotions of the officers. The men are drawn from the general population, but they are invariably sent to counties at a distance from their own families, and frequently changed to prevent their becoming familiar with the people. For them, as for their officers, promotion is chiefly to be gained by zeal against all national movements, whether dangerous to the peace or not. At public or even private meetings of men of national politics, constables are constantly sent to take notes and exercise a surveillance over those present. Police surveillance over individuals, obnoxious to the inspectors or their friends, is another regular branch of their duty; and at evictions large bodies are almost invariably in attendance, whether any resistance is offered to the sheriffs or not. As a police force, in the ordinary meaning of the words, the constabulary are almost useless except in a few of the larger towns; but as a means of making the government hateful to the bulk of the people, the system is strangely and perfectly constructed. Its annual cost, four years ago, was nearly seven millions of dollars, while that of public education barely reached three and a half millions, and the support of the poor throughout Ireland only involved a taxation of five and a half millions. That the continuance of such a system of police should be demanded by leading

members of the late English Ministry as a condition of Irish Home Rule, shows more clearly than a thousand pages of argument the incapacity of comprehending the simplest public affairs in Ireland which prevails among English statesmen.

From the foregoing remarks it may be gathered that no system of Home Rule which involves any interference either of English Ministers or of the Imperial Parliament can satisfy the wishes of the Irish people. The concession of elective county boards, partial reforms in the land laws, or allowing a national assembly to exercise the powers now entrusted to some of the numerous "Boards" that constitute the executive government of Ireland, would be useless in reconciling the minds of the Irish race to the English connection. For them a change of government, come it either within the British Empire or from its dismemberment, is a necessity. Under the combined load of foreign rule, excessive taxation, exorbitant rents, and administrative stupidity, the Irish nation is simply perishing. We have heard an Irish Viceroy, Lord Carlisle, boast, over twenty years ago, that during a still shorter space three hundred and sixty thousand cabins had been swept away from the face of Ireland; manufactures have disappeared one by one, and no sadder sight can be seen by the visitor to Ireland than the walls of the now empty factories and mills which meet the eye in every part of the island. The lands once cultivated have been turned to pasture, and much has relapsed to the barren morass or hill-side from which it had been reclaimed by the toil of the peasants whose cabins have been swept away by the evictor. Forty years ago six millions of acres were cultivated; to-day there are little over five. Every province, Ulster as well as Connaught, has shared in the general ruin, and, indeed, during the decade ending in 1881 the decay of people and wealth was proportionally greater in Ulster than in any other province. The fisheries have dwindled to one-sixth of what they were in 1848, and while the revenues are squandered with a lavish hand on a useless constabulary and a horde of worse than useless officials, the trifling outlay which would provide harbors and piers for the poverty-stricken fishing population of the West, and the want of which exposes them constantly to losses beyond their power to repair, is refused by official arrogance. While every other country in Europe has progressed during the last forty years, the population of Ireland has shrunk from eight and a quarter millions to less than five. The Turk has long been the symbol of misgovernment in the eyes of the civilized world, but no part of the Turkish Empire has experienced such a decay as has fallen on Ireland under the rule of constitutional England. To stop the progress of that decay even now, to remould the institutions of the country, so that its people may live

and thrive on its soil, to protect the life, liberty, and property of every Irishman, whether he be rich or poor, Saxon or Celt, and whether he loves his own land better than her foreign ruler or not, this is the essential condition to any reconciliation of the Irish race to the connection with England. Such a result can only be brought about by an Irish Legislature vested with the full and untrammelled control of Irish affairs within the bounds of Ireland.

Though it may cost a sacrifice to English pride, and still more to English race prejudice, thus to renounce all interference with the domestic policy of Ireland, it is not, in truth, a very serious material sacrifice. The money squandered on the official supporters of the government in Ireland is a burthen to the resources of Ireland, but it adds little to the comfort or prosperity of the English people. A contented and prosperous Ireland connected with the Empire by a common government for foreign affairs, for military and diplomatic service, and for the central executive presiding over these branches, would be an important addition to the strength of the empire in the complications which are sure to arise in the troubled political atmosphere of Europe. The transfer of Irish governmental business from the Parliament in Westminster to one in Dublin, would enormously increase the utility of that body for the home administration of England and the management of foreign affairs. The want of time to attend to the general concerns of the empire has become a constant complaint against Parliament, and several of the costly mistakes of recent years might have been avoided if the attention of Ministers had been free from the cares of the Irish question. The annexation of the Transvaal and the Zulu war, with its cost of thirty million dollars, and its series of ignominious disasters, the still more costly and unsuccessful campaigns in Afghanistan, with their outlay of over a hundred millions, and the dishonor and expense of the Soudan expedition, are a few specimens of the dangers which may any day follow from mistakes in policy in an empire like that of Great Britain. The closest attention is needed for the administration of a dominion extending to every quarter of the globe, and defended by a force which is insignificant beside the armies of every great European power. Yet, year after year, the greater part of the time of both ministers and Parliament is consumed in the ungrateful and hopeless task of misgoverning Ireland. The administrative power of the empire is wasted in the effort, as was the strength of Napoleon in the Spanish invasion. To stop that waste and increase the active work of the executive and legislature would be an enormous practical gain for England; but that can only be done by such a concession of self-government to Ireland as we have already indicated.

As to the connection with the Empire which Ireland would

accept, and which might satisfy all reasonable wishes of the English people for maintaining the integrity of the empire, it does not seem that any insurmountable difficulty need occur. The precedents of Canada and Australia prove that English public opinion can be brought to relinquish administrative control over parts of her dominion under pressure of necessity. The national prejudices are, no doubt, more strongly opposed now to Irish self-government than they were to self-government in Australia or Canada; but then, too, the motives which suggest its concession are much stronger. The details would necessarily be different. Ireland now bears a share in the burdens of the empire which was never borne by the colonies, and she will be doubtless required to bear it still. If skilfully adjusted, we do not believe that the burden would be too great, but, on this point, we are not perfectly certain. At the date of the Union, the resources of Ireland were estimated as bearing the relation of between one-eighth and one-ninth to those of England. At present, judging by the income-tax returns, the amount of the public debt held in the two countries, and the value of railroads in each, the wealth of Ireland is about one-twentieth that of England, while her contributions to the imperial taxation are about one-tenth of the whole. There is little doubt but the large relative increase in Irish taxation (sixty-eight per cent. in Ireland as against seventeen in England since the Russian war) has been one of the causes of the unexampled national decay alluded to already. With an intelligent government and a complete reform of the present administration, she might bear the load; but, on that point, we are by no means certain. One thing is sure, and that is, that the Irish taxpayers should reap the benefit of any economies that can be effected in their own administration; such, for instance, as in the constabulary expenditure, the vice-regal court, and the overpaid legal officials. The question of separate custom-houses, and the establishment of an Irish protective tariff, is one which, in the present free-trade policy of England, will excite considerable opposition; but, for ourselves, we are not inclined to believe it essential that such a right should be granted, though it would be highly desirable, as removing unnecessary interference of English or Imperial officials in the Irish government. Internal licenses might furnish protection, if needed, to Irish products, without interfering with the customs. Perhaps the most feasible solution of the question of imperial taxation would be a separate budget for the expenses connected with the central government, such as the army, navy, foreign and diplomatic service, the public debt, and the civil-list of the sovereign. The taxes necessary to meet these expenditures might be levied on particular branches of the revenue, either internal or external, applied uni-

formly to both countries, which would thus share in the common burdens in proportion to their respective wealth. The special expenditures of both England and Ireland might then be met at the judgment of their own representatives by additional imposts in any form they might deem most suitable. The taxes on certain articles might thus be exclusively reserved for Imperial purposes, leaving both England and Ireland, through their respective representatives, free to tax themselves in any way they pleased for their own domestic expenditure.

It should not be anticipated, however, even though the material difficulties in the way be not insurmountable, that they will be speedily disposed of. First in the House of Commons, and again in the House of Lords, we may expect to hear the time-worn charges against the whole Irish people repeated again and again during the coming session of the British Parliament. It is more than likely, indeed, that most of its time will be consumed, as that of many former sessions has already been, in endless debates on the Irish difficulty, in its new form of a powerful third party holding the balance between the two, which look on the government of the Empire as their own property. The Irish race must be prepared for a long-enduring struggle before it can hope for final success. It may be better that it should be so. In political life, as in war, real success is only to be won at the cost of sacrifice and by the practice of patient discipline. A vigorous campaign in a hostile assembly will be an invaluable training-school for the future statesmen of Ireland, if they are faithful to their task and fearless in its execution. It is better that every objection to Home Rule in its true sense should be threshed out in the British Parliament beforehand, than that that body should concede the boon in hot haste, only to seek to minimize it by subsequent interference with the action of the Irish Parliament in its own affairs. If the contest be carried on vigorously and wisely, every day of it will be an additional argument with thinking Englishmen against future interference in the affairs of Ireland. It is the nature of such a struggle to weary out and disgust the side which has nothing to gain, and that side is not assuredly the Irish one. The Irish people and their leader have already experienced the worst of English animosity, and, short of utter extermination, they have little more to fear. A sudden move of Russian forces on the Himalayas may any day remind England by how slender a thread her empire hangs together, and cause a revulsion of feeling in favor of securing an Irish alliance, such as is now being experienced on a smaller scale by the leaders of her great parties. "We bring two mighty deities with us," said the Athenian commander of old, when he sought to extort tribute from a Grecian island, "Force and Argument, and you will do well to

pay heed to them." "We admit their might," replied the beleaguered garrison, "but we too have two awkward protectors, Necessity and Poverty, and with their aid we will bide your attack." The Irish people to-day have the same allies as the Naxian islanders had against the power of Athens. They cannot abandon the fight, and they have no spoils to reward their conquerors, while England, with the power, has also the weakness of overgrown and worshipped wealth. The contest will be a long and stubborn one, and it would be premature to chant victory before the battle is fought; but if the Irish people and their representatives continue the struggle as they have maintained it during the last five years, sooner or later we may fairly hope for full success, and that Ireland shall be

"A nation once again."

THE SUPERNATURAL[1] AND INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT.

NOT many years ago, a writer of no mean acquirements, as a man of science and a historian, stated in one of the leading English Reviews that the result of religious belief on mankind, wherever that belief had had any influence whatever, had been "to sap the foundations of patriotism, to eradicate the moral instincts, and to stunt intellectual growth and development"—and for proof of his statements he appealed to history. The matter, he seemed to think, was one of most profound simplicity, and he made very short work of it. The details of this singular account have naturally no need of criticism; nor would it be consistent with our purpose to examine their value here. If we mention them at all, it is only because they constitute the opinion generally of the modern school of progress. And not only is this opinion one among their many dogmatically expressed judgments, but is really implied in all of them; and it is being accepted on all sides more or less consciously, and being repeated on all sides with more or less emphasis.

As long as such vulgar confusion on such an important point continues, as long as the mind of the age remains blind to one of the most fundamental and, one would think, one of the most obvious truths that history can furnish, so long will a true calculation

[1] It may be well to remind the reader that the term *supernatural* in the following paper is used not in the old Scholastic, but in the modern Agnostic sense.

be impossible of the prospects before humanity. The scope of the present paper will be to point and to direct, by a necessarily rapid and superficial historical review, the attention of thinking men to what was once considered a truism, to what is now complacently set down as a lie, and to what will, we hope, in a more lively way than ever, be by and by rediscovered as a truth. We will attempt to indicate that religious belief, so far from having had no influence, or an evil one, has really moulded all intellect and shaped all conduct that is distinctly human or distinctly civilized. And it would be no difficult task to show that religious belief is essential to all the hopes of those who are loudest in their outcry against it; that it is comprised not only in our conceptions of private character, but in the most advanced and liberal views of political and social progress. Of this assertion the annals of art, and of science, and of literature, afford the most complete confirmation. Nor can any one be deceived in this matter by an appeal to isolated historical facts, selected with no other aim, either in the choice or in the interpretation, than to support a forefixed bias or a foregone conclusion. For what we would wish to insist on here is not that our scientific sociological theorists are ignorant of history in the sense of being little acquainted with historical literature, though this too of many of them might, we conceive, be said with truth; the failure we attribute to them is something more serious. It is not that they have not advanced far enough in one field of inquiry, but that they have advanced no way at all in another; they may be foremost among those who know, or the most ignorant of all, with regard to *what* has happened in the history of the world, but in no fruitful way have they ever questioned *why?*

But, first, let us state more distinctly the exact bearing of our argument, the precise positions we desire to prove and disprove, and the definite schools or parties against whom what we shall have to urge shall be directed. These last, to designate them broadly, may be termed, in inconvenient if not new language, the school of Agnosticism: and the term will include more than it at first sight seems to do. For an Agnostic is not only one who denies simply that the supernatural has exerted any influence on the intellect of man, but who besides asserts that, supposing it to have exerted an influence, that influence has been evil. The Lucretian doctrine that religion is the "chief curse and prime affliction of the world," is asserted in positive terms by the doctors of Agnosticism.

And this brings us naturally to the matter now in hand. As the Agnostic school have treated philosophy, so have they treated the use of the supernatural. Let us take an instance. Let us take the doctrine which they claim as peculiarly their own, and which is so essential to their prophetic progress, and apply to it the tests

according to which all such development, whether intellectual, moral, or social, is, we are told, to be guided. The issue, to the Agnostic optimist, must, one would think, be surprising. The doctrine of the Rights of Man, for example, will be seen to have been founded on the supernatural. As mankind have hitherto professed it, it was essentially a theistic doctrine, a doctrine founded on the immortality of the soul: the belief in the rights of man connoted belief in a God who gave a sanction to those rights. As tried at the judgment seat of calm knowledge and sober intellect, the social part of this doctrine relies on the religious, not only for its support, but for its meaning. This was always its implied basis and generally its explicit one. It was on this Robespierre founded his extravagant Declaration; it was on this Saint Simon rested his visionary hopes and impossible schemes; while it can hardly be necessary to remind the American reader that it was on this that the whole case rested against slavery as slavery, and that it was these beliefs and these arguments that made the suppression of slavery not only possible to accomplish, but possible even to conceive or to wish for.

Now, how are the doctrines of this modern school modified by their rejection of the supernatural? To this the answer can be at once exact and final. Discrediting the old proofs of their truth, by detailed demonstration, as is thought, of their falsehood, rejecting the only conceivable foundation on which the beliefs in question have till now rested, modern Agnosticism is accomplishing, at once theoretically, and by and by will accomplish practically, the very reverse of all that their profuse prophecies of unlimited progress imply. And, first of all, let us take the example just brought up—man's equality. The economy of the Catholic Church builds up an absolute equality in salvation that comprises or can comprise, indiscriminately, all mankind. *Modern Science* disowns such equality. This, however, is but half the truth. It insists that they are unequal—and it does so with a harshness and a completeness of meaning that, till our day, was inconceivable. The brutality to his subjects of no oriental tyrant, the disdain of barbarians of no Grecian philospher, ever implied this inequality so fully as modern science explicitly declares it. Its whole aim and drift is to prove with increasing insistence that each man is the creature of his education and surroundings; that of his distinctively human value his body is the cause and the measure, and that not only are men's seeming inequalities real, but that in reality they are greater than they seem. No spiritual instinct or insight can pierce through and discover beneath the surface some common greatness, some treasure shared equally by all—for no

such treasure exists—but man is left the plaything of fortune, the child of circumstance.

In view of these two great defects in the dominant philosophy, its want of generalization, its utter inability to apprehend the bearing of events on each other, and its tendency to reject the supersensual, the unseen, the spiritual, it cannot be surprising to any one that it should be reluctant to recognize the supernatural as an important factor in intellectual development. For the empiricism that meanwhile reigns is, on the one hand, so curiously without historical sense, and so indifferent to historical method, that it seems unable either to conceive or to represent any supernatural force, either in its organic growth and completeness, or in its historical relation and significance; and on the other hand, its attitude towards supernatural phenomena is, if we may borrow a term from medicine, so purely *pathological* that it treats and deals with a fact as old and as universal as man, as a product of disease rather than health. Indeed, it is not too much to say that the various forms of empiricism—agnostic, skeptic, positivist—are all marred by the same original blot, marked by the same fundamental inabilities, and can as little explain the origin and progress of intellectual development as they can of themselves. Loudly proclaiming their great passion to find and formulate a science of history, they have hitherto been blind to the meaning of the great historical faiths, and have been unable to tell how they sprang, why they were or are, or what purpose they served. To ask these questions is to recognize an ideal significance in religion and an ideal purpose in the mechanism of this world that were fatal to any system whose first principle is to dispense with an ideal cause and presence in the universe. And hence, the philosophy that does not rise and end in the supernatural is a sapless, withered rationalism; its reason is like an eyeless socket, vainly illumined by the sun.

As with philosophy, so is it with literature. Literature will lose just as much as philosophy. "All its sublimity, its brilliance, and the great part of its interest depend on the idea of the supernatural, and would, in its absence, be absolutely unproducible." The aim of the supernatural—to change a living writer's metaphor—is, indeed, to make the soul a musical instrument which may yield music either to itself or to others at any appulse from without; and the more intense and real the idea is, the richer and more composite can this music be. Without the supernatural literature is like a simple pastoral pipe that will produce but one melody, and that not an elaborate one, rather a "deep andante moving in a bass of sorrow," which rolls so mournfully through the writings of our "modern galaxy of tuneful anarchists and pantheistic bacchants."

The grandest conceptions of the mind have their source in religious convictions. What is it that gives intensity to our thoughts, as a presence becomes awful when shrouded or enlarged, as vastness, or height, or depth is expanded towards the Infinite? Is it not that we recognize an existence higher than the natural? The tenderness and delicacy of the Hindoo epics evince it; the grandeur and sublimity of Greek poesy testify to it; the Holy Scriptures, the richest inheritance of the ages, prove it; and the response of the human mind demonstrates it. From the conditions of the mind and the imagination there arises for man a new world, a new order of being, which is recognized by every race and every age. This conception of the supernatural pervades every department of literature; it intrudes on the domain of painting and sculpture; it guides the imagination through the land of reverie and romance, and reigns unquestioned in the realms of poetry and philosophy. The highest culture serves but to grace it with every delight of fancy and refinement, and the grossest ignorance produces but a deplorable, fantastic exaggeration.

In earliest ages every forest and glen was the home of nymph or fawn; all nature was animate with invisible genii. The poet loved to sing of their graceful forms and people harsh nature with lovely images. It was a beautiful thought; and Grecian poetry still whispers it in our delighted ears. But in the oriental mind, these ideas attained a more complete development. The Arabian Nights contain the wildest flights of human imagination; the laws of nature are entirely disregarded; the natural blends with the supernatural, and space itself is thickly inhabited. Wizards, fiends, shipwrecked sailors, and wandering princes hurry across the stage; stately palaces, enchanted castles, and sumptuous mystic caverns meet our view; and fairies, furies, sultans, and beggars appear and disappear like the figures in a kaleidoscope. They are the dreams of the opium-eater, light, airy, and fantastic like the mosque and minaret beneath whose shadow they spring into existence.

It is merely stating an exact truth to say that poets to be great must be Christian. But Homer and Hesiod, Sophocles and Euripides, Æschylus and Pindar were great poets! True; but they had instincts and mental tendencies identical with those of Christians. They had a reverence for the spiritual world and divine authority. They never dreamed of atheism, agnosticism, materialism, or rationalism. It may, indeed, be urged that the great men, the cultured, representative men of old refused to credit much of the popular belief. It must be remembered that the supernatural in the ancient world of Paganism was something exceedingly unsettled and intermediate, and our classical divinity, though, of course, to some extent, an embodiment of it, does, in reality, em-

body but a very small part. Zeus and the minor gods of Olympus were vaguely conceived to be surrounded by some deeper mystery which, to the popular intelligence, was altogether undefined, and which even such men as Xenophon and Plato could only describe by extraordinarily confused and inadequate concepts.

The supernatural was a twilight, dim and diffused, but Christianity has brought it to a focus, and collected and concentrated the scattered rays that before were altogether imperceptible. "That vague 'idea of the Good' of which Plato said most men dimly augured the existence, but could not clearly express their augury, has been given a definite shape to by Christianity in the form of its Deity," the father of the human soul, and its arbiter, and what is incomparably more, its final rest, its delight, its desire. In the light of this thought, man stands out a vaster being, and every detail in the life of a human soul becomes more important beyond all comparison, unspeakably more momentous than the myriad worlds around. Ancient pagan literature had its supernatural, exercising a very potent influence on the grandest intellectual products of the age. The forms under which it was conceived were, it is true, most inadequate and most false; but through the depraved and dusky form there are certain to come beams of eternal truth, broken and scattered, straggling and refracted, by the intervening prisms of ignorance and error, but beams still that can help to interpret the universe, which, viewed through the most approved medium of the philosophy of matter, is but an infinite blank wall, confronted by an ignorance that never looks so hopelessly imbecile as when it pretends to be knowledge.

And now we feel no reader will find it irksome to accompany the "star-quenching angel of the dawn," as he travelled, nearly seven centuries ago, "with broad, slow wing from the Levant to the Pillars of Hercules, and from the summits of the frosty Caucasus across the Alpine ridges to the dark nakedness of the western isles," and resting on the sweet quiet bosom of the Bay of Naples, view the softest sunrise that ever lit up the east, or view the most gorgeous sunset that ever sank below the west. Our purpose, however, will carry us farther north. Let us leave, then, sweet Naples, pass by Rome with its classical antiquity, stop but a moment at ocean-born Venice, "rising with her tiara of proud towers," and keep on our way to the capital of France, to Paris, the fountain of fashion and the seat of science. Collected together in this splendid city, from England and Germany, from Italy and the East, was the highest that could be found at that day of courage, eloquence, and learning, the flower of chivalry, the depth of science, troubadours and minstrels, wits and beauties. Here were fostered the disciples of Averroës, the most celebrated of Arabian philosophers;

astrologers from Bagdad, with their loose garments and flowing beards; and Hebrews, learned and sedate, the interpreters of the hidden wisdom of precious manuscripts brought over from Arabia; learned professors of Humanities and Rhetoric, mature and masterly doctors of Philosophy; while men of profound scholarship poured forth the wealth of their accumulated learning in the University chairs of Theology. Let the reader fancy, if he can, the agitation that prevailed in Paris on the 23d of October, 1257, when the two noblest children of St. Francis and St. Dominic—Bonaventure and Thomas of Aquin—were to make their "public act" for the highest academical honors. Whoever knows anything of academical life, of doctors and lecturers, of students and professors, of those whose life labors are spent in unwavering devotion to literature and learning, and of the texture of their minds, can paint for himself a picture of the excited preliminary debates in the very streets of the University town, as men gathered in groups and bands to discuss and canvass the probable issue of the coming intellectual joust. He will see the long files of Dominicans—clothed in their religious habit that seems to blot out all idea of sensual admiration and carries away the mind into a loftier sphere, a higher range of thought, where beauty of far nobler sort finds congenial habitation—advancing from their convent, *L'ancien St. Jacques*, with elastic tread, and a perceptible expression of satisfaction, as they pick their passage through students, professors, and wondering crowds, towards the episcopal palace, where they will see their brother Thomas receive his ring and cap. The children of St. Francis, too, clad in their habit of coarse brown serge, girdled with their knotted cord, move somewhat more rapidly than usual their sandaled feet to witness Bonaventure display his wondrous knowledge before the assembled learning of Europe.

To defend a wide field of theological and philosophical truth before such an assembly and against the longest and keenest heads and the most skilful and practiced dialecticians, against well-seasoned professors and the *élite* of every Faculty, required a stout heart, a clear intellect, and an imperturbable coolness and self-possession which the pigmy intellects of our day, in spite of their endless boasting of enlightenment, and inane insistence on progress and originality, could never furnish.

Seated in their chairs on a raised platform, in view of the whole multitude, sit solemn and majestic the authorities of the University—the highest exponents of learning in the then civilized world—arrayed in the various robes symbolical of their various offices, and the different insignia representative of their different degrees: Bishops and Doctors of Divinity; Jurists and Canonists; Rectors and Provosts; Masters and Bachelors; Superiors of Religious

Houses and Generals of Religious Orders; the secular element and the regular; the gown and the hood, all are represented. Nor were the different ranks of the clergy alone in manifesting their interest in the approaching spectacle. Doubtless there was many a gallant knight and many a roguish varlet, many a thriving merchant and many an honest bourgeois, many a sturdy artisan and bright minstrel, many a noisy *jongleur* and witty singer of canzonets, who would willingly join himself to the joyful crowd that flowed uninterruptedly towards the palace, assured that his trouble would be overpaid to hear Thomas of Aquin "pour forth his wealth of learning, his novelty of proof, his calm eloquence, his divine fire, his inimitable simplicity, that had filled the world as it had never been filled before, and that now would be called forth in all their splendor as the Great Master makes his solemn act, performs the '*grand tour de force*,' in which he will be obliged to display what he ever so modestly tried to conceal—the wide circumference of his knowledge, the matchless grace of his dialectical skill, and the full swing of his gigantic intelligence."[1]

Men were not startled in those days as they are in these by the unusual deeds and privileges of chosen souls. Conscious of the supernatural, they took God's work for granted. They believed what they saw; they did not pry, and test, and examine, and lose their souls. Generally, they got nigher the truth than we do. Their minds were not scaled and corroded by false science. Much ignorant rhetoric is poured out in these days upon the great theologians, philosophers, and teachers of the Middle Ages. One writer pilfers the platitudes of another and parades them before the public—the public which never hardly has the time or the inclination to read the originals for themselves, or to study the real current of events.

The Scholastics, like all men, were not faultless; their system can be criticised. But one thing is certain: they were no mere "snowy-banded, delicate-handed, dilettante" performers. Science and education absorbed their whole strength, and occupied the most precious portion of their lives. They were, generally, men who had abandoned this world out of love for the next. They had something noble and heroic in their spiritual make to start with. They passed their days amid grand ideas; their convictions and their lives were above the earth. St. Thomas of Aquin was the living embodiment of the influence of the supernatural in moulding the mind. He belongs to the highest order of human greatness; a student, a contemplative, and a thinker, possessing the most architectonic mind the world has ever seen. In him the intellect reigns supreme; and not only is he supreme in intellect, but the calibre

[1] Life and Labors of St. Thomas of Aquin.

of his mind, its depth, exactness, and balance, its rapidity, splendor and strength, class him with Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle; while his illumination through grace, the influence of the supernatural, and the knowledge acquired by the light of revelation, at once lift him to a more eminent position than could possibly have been attained through the power of mere human genius and unassisted reason.

It is difficult to comprehend how the life of any of the great mediæval giants can be thoroughly appreciated by the mind of an educated man, leaving out of calculation the prodigious influence which the supernatural has exerted in moulding his intellect and influencing his personal opinions. Still less can any adequate estimate which would seek to compute the reach of moral principle and the influence of saintly genius be formed, without embracing a considerably wider range of thought than would be to our purpose, aiming, as we have done, at a short and somewhat desultory paper, rather than at displaying the genesis and development of truth and the impress of a master-mind upon his age. It has always appeared to us that the most telling influence, the most pregnant and momentous mastery exerted by the great saints of the Catholic Church has been that of rare mental ability and power in confronting and controlling the passionate prejudices and mental aberrations of maddened epochs, as well as of blinded, swerving men. Their unassuming piety, their stainlessness of conscience, their faith in the spiritual, their delightful self-distrust, their ingenuous simplicity, their God-like unselfishness,—all these form, as it were, the fountain head whence their far-reaching influence shoots. Keen apprehension of reason, sober judgment, penetrating discrimination, vivacity of mind and undeviating rectitude of will, what are they but the manifestations of a highly cultivated moral nature, and the instruments God-given and God-fashioned for carrying into execution some extraordinary purpose of Providence?

It seems to us that the intelligent student of history must conclude, as there unfolds to his mind the many-sided influence of heroic sanctity when manifested by a man of massive mind, of sovereign genius, and of sagacious judgment, that firmness of command, steadiness of view, and unswervingness of purpose are naturally conditioned by a certain supernatural moral constitution of head and heart; that the four outgrowths of the supernatural, —purity, reverence, adoration, love,—are the four corner-stones on which that premonitory beacon, that intellectual Pharos reposes, which, when all around and far beyond it is darkness and confusion, stands up in the midst of the tempest, the emblem of peace, the symbol of order, the minister of light, the token of safety.

Let us briefly sum up here the conclusion we wish to draw, and

which what we have said will, we think, fully justify. The great works of antiquity are distinctly traceable to the influence of the supernatural. To the use of the supernatural Æschylus owes his most startling scenes and most lofty conceptions. It pervades the poetry of Homer and Hesiod, and exerts its influence through the pages of Pindar, Sophocles and Plato. And not the Greeks alone, but the highly-colored and exciting thought of all the East, the philosophical mysticism of Egypt, and the opium dreams of India. The same emotion that agitated the breast of Homer, as he felt the sublimity of his grandest conceptions, made the wheels of Juggernaut welcome to the Hindoo devotee. Then, fixing the thirteenth century as a standpoint in the Middle Ages, we shall find the supernatural ranging up and down, from the most rapt speculations of St. Thomas to the most vigorous action, from the ecstatic transports of Dante, as his eyes behold the glories of heaven, to his melancholy cries of horror as his ears are smitten with the groans of misery from the infernal torture-house which he reveals. Such is the character of the supernatural, and in its wondrous influence is manifested the power which it exerts in moulding the human mind. It expands the mind beyond the limits of the finite, and whispers a thought of Him who is Infinite —Eternal. It speaks throughout all ages the eternal protest of spirit against matter. Who can estimate the influence it exerts? Ever saying to man, "There is a world beyond the present," ever hinting to his mind the hope of eternal life, it has stood, a steadfast bulwark of truth, and, through centuries, has fashioned the intellect and influenced the opinions of mankind.

We know that in the style of to-day we ought hardly venture to so much as mention the word poetry, unless we be prepared to unfold and display the mysterious beauty and hyperbolic inspiration of some recently developed child of "light and sweetness." We confess at the outset that we have no such exhibition to offer. We do not intend making a rhetorical study of our late poetry as works of art, though this, we conceive, might not be without alarming consequences to many ridiculous impressions and current opinions, and might decidedly cheapen our estimate of much of it. Our design at present, however, is an altogether different one. In glancing rapidly at a few of our modern English poets, we do not pretend that their verses are not good verses. On the contrary, we think most of them ingeniously conceived, as musical and as graceful as the verse of any age in our history.

But there lies this original blot on every product of our modern academic poets of the cultured school of *ennui*, that, repudiating the elevating influence of the supernatural, and limited to the merely visible world, they are bound to make the most of it; to dwell on

its magnificence, to analyze its beauty, to make it the illimitable theme of wonder and admiration. Nature, indeed, as our forefathers understood and interpreted it, was always bursting forth into a great orchestral hymn of praise to the Creator, such as Dryden fancied in the very process of evolving cosmos out of chaos:

> From harmony, from heavenly harmony
> This universal frame began;
> From harmony to harmony
> Through all the compass of the notes it ran,
> The diapason closing full in man.

Now our modern Agnostic poets are always striving to give to the creature the glory which this "shining frame" proclaims the due of the Great Original; and with audacious blasphemy they announce the death of God and the fetichistic apotheosis of man.

> And the love-song of earth, as Thou diest, resounds through the wind of her wings,
> Glory to Man in the highest! for Man is the master of things.

The unmitigated, diabolical wickedness of such a sentiment is a sufficient apology for the citation.

Now, this poetic deification of Nature is the choice of certain facts for the sake of their beauty and their sublimity. It deliberately sets aside multitudes of other facts that are not beautiful, and yet are very real. Deep is our debt to the magicians who have exhibited to us the world radiant and harmonious. It is an ideal of priceless value, precious and invigorating to spirit. But it is not the real truth, or rather not the whole truth—far from it. The world is quite as often wild and discordant. In thought we generally see but the bright side, but stern reality, hard fact, brings us face to face with the dark side. We need as little think this world all beauty as think it all horror. It is made up of both, of loveliness and ghastliness, of harmony and discord, of agony and joy, of life and death. The nature-worshippers, incapable of seeing a higher purpose in it all, are blind and deaf to the death-struggles and shrieks which meet at every turn the seeker after truth. Of course, to express feeling in such beautiful, or sublime, or humorous forms as may strike the sense with admiration, overwhelm it with awe and astonishment, move it to uncontrollable pity, or scorn, or laughter, is the aim of the artist, working, whether in color, or in light and shade, or in marble, or in speech, or in song. And sympathy with all the inner teaching of nature may be fresh and vital truth in the form of immortal art. No wise one of us would willingly despise the faintest thrill of it, or lose a

verse from that magnificent psalmody of nature, which from Tyrtæus to Tennyson is one of the best gifts that genius has bestowed on man. Our love of this rich and potent earth, our awe at this mysterious system which peoples space with a marshalled host of worlds, our sense of the profound unity and harmony of the mighty mechanism, are now transfused and enlightened by all the insight of all the poets, from Job and the Royal Hebrew bard, and Homer and Theocritus, to Shakespeare and Wordsworth, together with all the thoughts of the philosophers from Pythagoras, Aristotle, and Plato, to St. Augustine, St. Thomas, and the other mighty minds who saw in it not the wild working of ungovernable chance, but the purposed outcome of a perfect and almighty will.

But after all, this worship of nature is but one side even of poetry, and that not its grandest. No poets have surpassed in this field the greatest in the ancient and in the modern world. Homer, the poet of the sea; Shakespeare, the poet of the air, he who saw the "floor of heaven thick inlaid with patines of bright gold." And yet in Homer, as in Shakespeare, the worship of nature holds but a subordinate place. To these great minds, the "folds of many-fountained Ida," "the waste of hoary brines," "the moonlight sleeping on the bank," the "morn walking over the brink of some high eastern hill," are but the frame wherein are set their pictures of living men and women and societies; of passions, sufferings, character; of hope, despair, love, devotion.

Poetry, taken as a whole, should present us with an image of man, not of inanimate nature; the drama of real life, not a dream of the universe. And if the starry night is beautiful, it may be nothing to the smile of a little child. One speech of Solomon or Prometheus or Hamlet will teach us incomparably more than ten thousand sunsets. There lies in the heart of the poorest and meanest child a force that cannot be even stated in terms of the deepest philosophy of the physical universe; and 'twill be long ere all the science and all the steam-hammers of the world will beat out a sunset into an act of mercy.

Alongside of this fine temper—man's love of the unfathomable glories of the scene around him—which the amiable prophets of progress and regeneration affect, there lies the opposite extreme—the pessimistic theory—preached and propounded by the poetical worshippers of Schopenhauer and Hartmann, who hold that life is but a tumult and an anguish, universal, meaningless; the embodiment of vain longings, hopeless griefs, endless toil. They have not even as much intelligent insight as that poet waiting for the light, who once sang that the high gods made man, taking

Fire and the falling of tears,
And a measure of sliding sand
From under the feet of the years.
  In his heart is a blind desire,
In his eyes foreknowledge of death:
He weaves and is clothed with derision,
He sows and he shall not reap,
His life is a watch or a vision
  Between a sleep and a sleep.

Faith partially draws the veil aside and man perceives that his origin was not blind chance, his end will not be sleep.

Strong Son of God, Immortal Love,
  Whom we that have not seen Thy face,
  By faith, and faith alone, embrace,
Believing where we cannot prove—
Thou wilt not leave us in the dust;
  Thou madest man, he knows not why:
  He thinks he was not born to die,
And Thou hast made him; Thou art just.

Those who lift the blasphemous cry of a helpless, hopeless revolt, have thrown away divine faith, the one key of the world's great enigma; keeping their human passions quick and strong, they take away the supernatural from creation. What wonder if they are dissatisfied with the dregs that remain behind? For "the sum of man's misery is even this, that he feel himself crushed under the wheels of Juggernaut, and know that Juggernaut is no divinity, but a dead mechanical idol."[1] It is scarcely necessary in the face of this blighting creed to raise the supernatural vision of eternity, of love in reality stronger than death, of the shortness of this cold twilight, and the brightness of a better day, when human nature, losing no human tenderness, no sympathetic thought, no mutual joy of kindred souls that made it beautiful on earth, shall have all these made impassible, immortal, inexhaustible. There is no need to dwell on the hideous skeleton which pessimistic philosophy or poetry may confront us with. No matter how loudly it may be cried in his ears that all of him will die, man will hold in his innermost consciousness to immortality in some form. For from creation's dawn to its end, from the savage to the sophist, the united voice of man is the same forever—"Non omnis moriar, multaque pars mei vitabit libitinam."

If indeed it were not so, then

Might we find, ere yet the morn
  Breaks hither over Indian seas,
  Death's shadow waiting with the keys
To shroud us from our proper scorn.

---

[1] Carlyle's *Characteristics.*

Assuredly there is something in this state of existence that baffles all merely human inquiry. There are a thousand discords everywhere, the fragments of countless broken lives; a vast weight of suffering indiscriminately dealt by chance and change, or heaped by men upon each other; an unknown force called life, which science fails to analyze, which can be blotted out in a moment, which cannot be restored, and death which, as far as mortal sight can penetrate, is the end of everything. Doubtless without the supernatural this world would be, "from pole to pole, a very lazar-house of woe." Here are four lines of the Coryphæus of English faithless poets, which, if mankind believed them and one realized them, might well make them declare that life was not worth its striving and pain, and would render impregnable the position of the pessimist.

> We are baffled and caught in the current, and bruised upon edges of shoals:
> As weeds or as reeds in the torrent of things are the wind-shaken souls.
> Spirit by spirit goes under, a foam-bell's bubble of breath,
> That blows and opens in sunder, and blurs not the mirror of death.

Against this dismal view of life the supernatural appeals to us through our reason and through the innate instincts of the heart. Tennyson has given beautiful expression to the persuasiveness of the appeal and the unconquerable yearnings of the soul for immortality. This is the heart's answer to the melancholy lines just quoted.

> My own dim life should teach me this,
> That life shall live forevermore;
> Else earth is darkness at the core
> And dust and ashes all that is.
> 'Twere best at once to sink to peace
> Like birds the charming serpent draws,
> To drop head foremost in the jaws
> Of vacant darkness and to cease.

Were it not so, says the poet of the heart's instinct, man would be a monster, a "dragon's of primeval slime were mellow music matched with him." And so we find the most thoroughgoing materialistic school has found it necessary to provide something for man's spiritual nature, and has made a shadowy divinity out of the abstract being of humanity, and a shadowy immortality of the soul out of a figment that the soul's good deeds do live. George Eliot, "in sad, perplexéd minors," voices this agnostic yearning:

> Oh! may I join the choir invisible
> Of those immortal dead, who live again
> In lives made better by their presence. So
> To live is heaven.

Her far-reaching intellect clearly perceived that the most exquisite art cannot make of life deprived of immortality other than a "tale full of sound and fury signifying nothing." And her own great fame, paradoxical as it may seem, is a reward of her loyalty to early teachings that were distinctly religious. Her soul, turned though it was to atheism, kept some memories, a fading reminiscence, a running glimpse of the truth.

It is impossible to calculate the influence which the supernatural has had upon poetry. Love itself, that seems to furnish endless poetical capital, has not, on the whole, been so powerful an incentive to song as religion. The perfections of the Divine Being, and of those mortals who seemed to partake most largely of those perfections, have been the rapturous and constant theme in verse, not only of the chosen people to whom a special revelation was made, but of the most ancient of heathen writers. "Agnostic poetry is a studied attempt on the part of an unbelieving modern sect to reverse the order of things existing from the beginning of the world," and, notwithstanding their boasting, endless and inane pretence of culture and enlightenment, a persistent effort to turn the face of man earthwards, to teach him to growl in morbid lamentation over fancied evils, to revel in an amorphous, black, and barbarous melancholy, to indulge in blasphemy, and to set up in the literary mart a premium on the pessimistic pagan insanity. Under pretence of exalting man, of refining and elevating his intellect, it dishonors and reduces him to the level of the brute creation, stripping him of all moral responsibility, emancipating him from all divine law. "The Christian poet," to quote the words of a recent writer, "can be as subjective and as objective as any agnostic; and it will be long before a singer, thinking scorn of Christianity, will lay bare the secrets of the human heart like Dante, or dwell upon and depict the charms of external nature, which is the art of God, with the power or sweetness of Wordsworth." Under the pressure of the sorrow that no human life escapes, the verse of the unbeliever is the lifting of a puny, but wrathful, arm against the God in whom it believes not, and whom it names only to blaspheme; the poetry of the soul that rests in the supernatural is the upraising of prayerful hands, and the setting heavenwards of a face that has known tears, alas! but knows also and better far the joy of thanksgiving and the peace of an assured hope.

A NATIONAL CATHOLIC LIBRARY.

TO one who walks through the library of the Xavier Union, in New York, there arises a feeling of grateful interest, considering the brief period in which that organization has, by its zeal and energy, been enabled to collect a library of upwards of fifteen thousand volumes. That the selection of books is a creditable one is attested by many critical judges, and Monsignor Capel publicly testified his indebtedness to it for the use of important Catholic works, which he could find nowhere else, even in the great city of New York.

The Carroll Institute, in Washington, our national capital, has a similar library of excellent books, well managed and receiving constant accessions. Catholic libraries exist in other parts of the country, showing that a right spirit has been awakened among our young men especially, to form collections of books, with a view mainly to those by Catholic authors and bearing on the Church in its various relations.

Where many persons thus combine to form libraries for general use, there must necessarily arise the taste which will lead to the formation by individuals of private libraries. Hitherto there have been very few Catholics known in this country as book collectors or bibliophiles. Dr. E. B. O'Callaghan and Rev. J. M. Finotti were collectors in their day, and it is by no means creditable to the Catholic body that both their libraries were allowed to be scattered in the auction-room. The library of Dr. Emmet is extremely rich and valuable; Charles C. Moreau, of New York, was one of the members of the Bradford Club, which gave several important works, and did much to cultivate good taste. The Honorable John Kelly, of New York, has a large and well-selected library, and enjoys his books, as does John T. Doyle, of San Francisco. Extensive as the writer's acquaintance is with publishers and book-dealers, few names occur to him, amid a host of book-buyers known to him, who can be classed as Catholics.

What constitutes the libraries of wealthier Catholic families, it is not easy to tell. Most, we fear, have but a few books, picked up at random, without any settled plan, and with no view to the general instruction of the household. Few, we believe, could show any series of books adapted to give the younger members a higher knowledge and appreciation of their faith and the unapproachable superiority of the Church in every essential point. Yet, if the

home library does not possess them, ignorance must prevail for the associate libraries, such as we have noticed, and our steadily-growing College libraries can benefit but a select few. Where, then, are our young Catholics of leisure to acquire such knowledge as they want when they feel the need of information in regard to any Catholic topic often misunderstood or misrepresented?

It is in vain for any Catholic thus situated to enter our great public libraries, like the Astor, the New York Society, the Public Library, or Atheneum, at Boston, the Philadelphia Library, or any similar one. There are congresses of librarians, and manuals for librarians, but, when we examine them, we can only wonder at the stupendous ignorance of librarians and library managers as to everything Catholic, and their utter lack of comprehending what standard books they ought to have.

A kind of Library Guide, by Perkins, if memory does not play false, was once consulted, just to see what the gentleman's ideas of a Catholic department might be. A more ludicrous exhibition of imbecility certainly never astonished us. There was not a single standard work in any department: what he proposed was a mere random collection of rubbish. Yet, one would think that any librarian, with ordinary common sense, could lay out a plan, and ascertain what was the best book in each branch. To treat of any religion, the instinctive division would be, Dogma, Worship, Government, History. Each would have its subdivisions. Dogma would embrace *Biblical*,—a Catholic Bible and Commentary, such as Migne's "Cursus Scripturæ Sacræ," Calmet's "Dictionary;" *Patristic*,—a set of the Fathers; *Scholastic*,—the works of St. Thomas Aquinas, and some recent work like "Perrone;" *Moral Theology*, represented by St. Alphonsus Lignori. Worship, by the Roman "Missal" and the "Breviary," in Latin and English, and by some minor English works, like Rock's "Hierurgia," Cochin or O'Brien on the Mass, Wiseman on the Ceremonies of Holy Week; Gavantus, The Ceremonial of the Church, the "Rituale Romanum;" works on the minor devotions of the Church, and devotions among the people. Government, by one of the great collections of the Councils, supplemented by the "Collectio Lacensis," the "Bullarium Magnum," Kenrick's "Primacy of the Apostolic See," some standard work on the Priesthood. History, a work like "Natalis Alexander," the more recent "Rohrbacher," or, in English, "Alzog," or "Darras." To these could, of course, be added, if opportunity afforded, Helyot's "Religious Orders," or the special histories of great orders by Wadding, Orlandinus, etc., or histories of the Church in special countries; the "Bollandists" for the department of Biography, with "Alban Butler" as an English compend, adding separate lives of most eminent saints and person-

ages, as they seemed to be called for. Such a collection need not be very large or costly, but it would enable any one to understand and look up questions arising in any book he might read, which would be obscure without a knowledge of what is really Catholic Dogma, Worship, Government, and History.

Incunabula and illuminated manuscripts are picked up by our public libraries, but, Catholic as these books are, there are rarely Catholic competitors when they appear in the auction room. We know no Catholic collection of illuminated manuscripts, although these are almost exclusively Catholic. Indeed, the finest collection we ever heard of was made by a Baptist clergyman. When the Gutenberg Bible—the first printed book, the first Bible printed by Catholics, who were the first printers—was offered for sale, or when the Missal of Pope John XXIII. was held up in the auction room, no Catholic bids were heard. No wealthy member of our Church was as ready to put his money in such a venture; and yet, even as an investment, either would have paid.

If the homes of many of the faithful are so devoid of works that would inspire the young with such a knowledge of the doctrines, worship, and history of the Church as would make them thankfully proud of the grace of Faith bestowed upon them, and make them fear naught so much as to lose it, there are occasionally Protestant gentlemen whose shelves contain enough Catholic books to make a very fair library for a Catholic family. In the catalogue of Prof. Leander Wetherell, sold last November in Boston, we were struck by the number. Audin's "Life of Henry VIII." and of "Luther;" Balmez's "Protestantism" and "Philosophy;" Berington's "Middle Ages;" Brownson's "Review," "Essays," and "American Republic;" Burnet's "Path;" Butler's "Lives of the Saints;" "Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent;" "Catholic Pulpit;" "Catholic Year;" Chateaubriand, "Genius of Christianity" and "The Martyrs;" Thayer's "Controversy;" Darras's "History of the Church;" Dixon's "Introduction to the Holy Scriptures;" Bishop England's Works, and so on, through the whole alphabet.

Our college libraries, the libraries of associations like the Xavier Union and the Carroll Institute, the libraries that our recently formed historical societies are gathering, and such as Rev. A. A. Lambing is forming, all will do good, but it is mainly local. We need something more. When V. Rev. John Carroll entered the lists with Wharton, he felt the want of books; he was forced to appeal in all directions to obtain books to quote authorities or expose falsifications. "Yes," the reader may say, "but that was a hundred years ago, and there is no such need now." We wish there were not, but the very day we write this we are informed that a

learned Professor, with libraries of some reputation at his hand, is obliged from time to time to visit other cities in order to verify references, examine authorities, compare editions.

As the public libraries in the country have not, and can scarcely be expected, for many years to come, to place on their shelves even the meagre number of volumes that ought to be there to enable readers and writers to speak intelligently of Catholic matters, Catholics must devise some plan to supply the want.

The time will come, perhaps, when utter ignorance of Catholic doctrine and Catholic life will be considered disgraceful, but it is not so now; and men well informed in every other branch of knowledge except a knowledge of the religion of their own ancestors, every day with the utmost serenity gravely enunciate statements that a Catholic child could refute. Once, after a meeting of a learned society, the writer heard the Rev. Dr. Osgood express his wonder that, in the large city, such records as we were regarding, the arrow-head inscriptions on tablets from Nineveh, should be a sealed book, intelligible but to a few. Our answer was, that a greater wonder existed in the fact that the cultivated and educated men of one-half the population of the city could not give an intelligent account of the faith, government, or worship of the other half, although their own ancestors professed it for centuries, and they themselves would persist in talking about it as though they were as familiar with it as they were with the alphabet.

This is no exaggeration. The late Dean Stanley, twice to our knowledge, and perhaps oftener, cited as a proof that the power of absolution was not confined to the priesthood, what he stated as an undeniable fact, namely, that at the commencement of the Mass the priest, and the clerk representing the people, each recited the Confiteor, and that the clerk recited the prayer "*Indulgentiam, absolutionem,*" etc., absolving the priest, and the priest did it, absolving the people from sin. Now, apart from the fact that the sacrament of penance is not administered in the Mass at all, it required only to open a missal anywhere, or a Catholic prayer book containing the Ordinary of the Mass, to see that the alleged fact existed only in the imagination of the Dean. The "*Indulgentiam*" is said by the priest alone, and not by the clerk.

Sir Walter Scott makes a lay brother hear a man's confession and absolve him; A. H. Everett, a cultivated writer, tells us that he saw an Ursuline nun say Mass in New Orleans; Street, the poet, opens his poem on Frontenac with Mass at sunset, and Shakespeare editors for three centuries have persisted in printing the utterly absurd expression, "ere evening mass," instead of "ere evening wanes," just as in their Bibles they have for more than a

century printed "strain at a gnat," instead of "strain out a gnat."*

Till our non-Catholic friends come to a realizing sense of their deficiency, we cannot expect them to place in the libraries books to serve as guides to extricate the "children of the mist" from the benighting shades in which they have so long complacently wandered.

The public libraries will not until the day dawns begin to supply the want of reading men; our present Catholic libraries are not broad enough in scope. There are priests, religious writers, and students of all kinds in every part of the country, who find a want of books from time to time, which it will be very slow and often too expensive for any one person to import unseen, merely to consult, perhaps, for an hour, to verify certain statements, or grasp the general treatment of a subject. But the books are not accessible here, and there is no way of consulting them abroad by proxy.

To meet the real want in this country we need a grand central Catholic library, to be gradually enriched with every work of merit in dogmatic, moral, mystic, and ascetic theology, biblical literature, and linguistics, patristics, liturgical and ceremonial, canon law, church history, hagiography, and biography. But if this library is created, how is it to be useful to the Catholics throughout the country? The question certainly presents difficulties, but we think they are not insurmountable.

We may learn something from others. An institution was established a few years ago at Chautauqua with the object of giving instruction in different branches by correspondence. The professors send out lessons to members of the class, receive and answer letters in reply, explaining difficulties that pupils meet, and correct the exercises written by pupils to show their mastery of the lesson. The system is slow, but many whose education has been neglected in some branch have found it an excellent means of progressing under intelligent guidance, and the project seems to have been successful. This corps of men are constantly aiding persons in all parts of the country, and the idea seems likely to be taken up in other directions. A society in this country devoted to the study

* After the recent death of His Eminence Cardinal McCloskey, the writers for the press almost universally showed their ignorance of the government of the Church. The great number of them supposed that his successor as Archbishop would succeed him in the Cardinalate; when really his only successor as Cardinal will be the next one appointed by the Pope, or transferred by the Pope to his titular church, *Sancta Maria supra Minervam*. His successor as Archbishop was one who had been appointed with the express *right of succession*. One was an office of counsellor in the great Senate of Christendom, legislative; the other that of executive in a portion of the church within local limits. The two offices had no more connection than those of mayor of a city and director of a bank, where they happened to be held by the same person.

of history and genealogy pays a salary to a gentleman residing in England who is thoroughly familiar with the great collection of wills in England, and able to refer to county and family histories. Inquiries desired by the members of the society are transmitted to him, and he effects undoubtedly more than the student would by crossing the Atlantic in person.

If our projected University were in operation, as we hope soon to see it, a body of Fellows might be established attached to a great library, with a salary, whose duty it would be to make researches, answer queries, and where necessary send a work to the regular subscribers to the library.

In it, as in our actual circulating libraries, there will be, of course, a large class of books of indispensable reference, more easily attainable, which are not allowed to go out of the library; but it might be a circulating library for a great mass of works. The subscribers to such a scheme, if the plan were put in a practicable shape, would, we think, be large and the maintenance of the library assured. The great difficulty would be to begin, and form such a nucleus of works that it could begin operations within a year or two, for the "Corps of Respondents," though capable men should be chosen and be willing to undertake the labor, must have the requisite works to enable them to reply.

Here is a case which especially calls for endowments from the wealthy, and if the library is annexed to the University, its features of utility might be brought home to many who fail to see the necessity of the University, and who hitherto have made no large contributions, as unlike as can be to the California millionaire who recently set aside twenty millions of dollars for a great university. Many will understand the idea of a great Catholic circulating library whose line of thought does not enable them to grasp the idea of a university; if they help to build up a grand library connected with the University, they will have done much to ensure its success. The project ought not to be made to distract the minds of our people from that great work, but to lead them up to it. Some of our liberal-minded men ought to take up the question of the great University library as their especial part of the work, and leave its shelves loaded with the lore of the Church's nineteen centuries of existence, as the noblest monument to preserve their memory when they depart, and to hand down their name with honor to future generations. No family could wish or have a more enduring monument than a department in such a library, founded and maintained by it, bearing to all time the family name. In thousands of books that department would in time be referred to by name till its reputation was as wide as the Church itself.

If it should be deemed by those whose opinions are undoubtedly

most entitled to respect, for they are invested with authority, that the connection of such a library with the University would be incompatible, some one of our large cities might be taken as the site for such a library, and a society or combination of societies labor in unison to extend it and conquer success by steady, intelligent effort. The libraries of the Xavier Union, of the Provincial Seminary, of Historical Societies, might form a nucleus which would grow by the accession of the collections of clergymen of literary tastes, who would feel a pride in leaving their collections to an institution where their name would be perpetuated. The subscriptions throughout the country to maintain such an institution and endow fellowships would surely come when the whole plan was put forward. The fellowships would be a necessary part to enable students at a distance to obtain intelligent, learned, and scientific aid in the treatment of any question. The late Mr. Lenox had projected such fellowships, in the library which he founded, intending to give funds to afford a salary of $1500 or more to each student of a particular branch. Proof of real work done was to be given in some prescribed form, but the object was to aid scholars, rather than to diffuse knowledge, as we propose; yet that would certainly have resulted. Applications for information, addressed to the Library, would be referred to these Fellows, according to the subject as to which light was desired. In such a library as we propose, the Fellows would be called upon specially to answer the correspondence of members as an essential part of their work.

In a few years we should have throughout the country a number of trained men, conversant with different branches of Catholic knowledge, and so ready in bibliography and all pertaining to the proper keeping, arrangement, and cataloguing of a library, and so fitted to see and supply its wants, that our smaller local libraries would find competent and excellent librarians, under whom these collections would increase not only in number, but in merit. Such men would be able to direct and guide students and save them from investigation made at a distance, by leading them to the real sources of information, often by solving the difficulty on the spot, or obtaining by correspondence all that was needed, their knowledge of books and libraries enabling them to seek a solution at the proper spot, while the ordinary student could not do so.

These local libraries could be made places where every week readings are given to popularize our literature, give a taste for good books, and so tend to elevate the general taste, increase the number of readers, and in that way enable the publishers to give a host of works that are actually needed, and put a stop to the hawking of claptrap books that are sold to the unwary by the bait of a highly

gilded cover. We must give the people good books, but it is also necessary to show them the merit of books, and enable them to distinguish gold from pinchbeck, and to detect impositions.

The great library cannot exist alone. It must have smaller local libraries to prepare the way, and these to thrive must not only have books, but make them known, appreciated and enjoyed. A pleasant room with a little music, and a half hour's reading of some good author will draw people. This system has been tested in Cleveland and proved successful. It has not yet been tried by Catholics, but it is really the idea of St. Phillip Neri, and can scarcely fail among our people. Those who attend will talk of what they hear, others will come, and of those who cannot some will have their interest aroused sufficiently to get the book and read for themselves. In the deluge of trash showered on the land, and almost forced upon people, persons who wish to read cannot always tell what to take up. Worthless, bad books are read because they are at hand, and easily got; read in ignorance of their real character. A library making good books known can also effectively warn against evil as well as propagate what is sound. This local education by living libraries will be all the more necessary to excite the interest which is absolutely required to maintain heartily and generously a great central Catholic Library.

ST. CYPRIAN AND THE ROMAN SEE.

AMONG the many strange misconceptions current among the members of the Anglican communion, relative to the constitution of the early Church, none is more remarkable than the curiously distorted view given in all their theological works, whether text-books of ecclesiastical history, or treatises of a dogmatic or controversial nature, of the character and life-work of St. Cyprian, and of his relations to, and dealings with, the Apostolic See. He is represented as a man entirely ignorant of any peculiar headship existent in the See of Rome, or, if the germ of any such idea is contained in his mind at all, it is merely that he regards the Roman Bishop as *primus inter pares*—first among equals—an accident of position, due, doubtless, to the secular dignity of his episcopal city as the metropolis of the civilized world. We propose to examine four of the principal passages from the Saint's writings which Anglicans are in the habit of citing as arguments against the "Romanism" of St. Cyprian's Catholicity. Let us see whether the words of the holy bishop of Carthage can really be brought up as witnesses against the faith, for which he so earnestly contended—can, indeed, be utilized by those whose aim is to break and destroy that *unity* of the Church in whose defence he expended the supreme efforts of his eloquence.

We are convinced that the only reason why Anglicans should suppose, as they profess to do, that these passages from St. Cyprian are, in the face of so many undoubted testimonies of that saint to the Roman primacy, inimical to the Petrine supremacy, is, because they have not seriously considered them, either as regards the causes of their being written, their surrounding circumstances, or even their grammatical construction. We propose, on the present occasion, to do so as briefly as we can.

In the first place, those who know anything about St. Cyprian, who he was, and what his character was, must see plainly that the use which is being made of his words by the opponents of the Church of Rome, is anything but complimentary to him. For, if St. Cyprian really intended what Anglicans would represent him as meaning, then he was guilty of using words which had no intelligible signification, which were simply nonsense, and of contradicting besides, while in a state of anger and excitement, the principles of a lifetime.

Now, whatever the opinion of Anglicans regarding St. Cyprian

may be, we, as Catholics, venerate him as a saint, and we are not prepared to charge him with folly and self-contradiction, simply for making use of expressions which are capable of an interpretation perfectly consistent with his other utterances and with common sense.

One would think that Anglicans must surely agree with us so far as to allow that, when a good and holy man gives vent to words which are, at least, capable of two interpretations, one of which violates common sense and the evidence of surrounding facts, and, moreover, flatly contradicts the principles enunciated with the greatest emphasis in his other carefully thought-out works; and the other of which is perfectly consistent with sense and facts, and with his own words and sentiments uttered elsewhere, it is a matter of common justice to such a man to adopt the latter, and not in such a case to insult his intelligence and his consistency by utilizing the former, merely in order that we may make a catspaw of him for our own purposes.

The first passage cited by Anglicans in this connection, to which we shall here allude, will be found in *Epistle LXXI:*

"For neither did Peter, whom the Lord chose first and on whom He built His Church, when Paul afterwards disputed with him about circumcision, claim to assume anything arrogantly to himself, so as to say that he held the Primacy, and should rather be obeyed by those who were lately and newly come."

It is a singular fact that this particular use of St. Cyprian's words is, by no means, new, nor confined to Anglicans and schismatics of this century. Precisely the same contention was raised by the Donatists, fifteen hundred years ago; and we know of no better reply to the former than that which the great St. Augustine himself addressed to the latter:

"The authority of Cyprian," says he, "does not alarm me, because I am reassured by his humility. We know, indeed, the great merit of the bishop and martyr, Cyprian, but is it anything greater than that of the apostle and martyr, Peter, of whom the said Cyprian speaks as follows, in his epistle to Quintus: 'For neither did Peter, whom the Lord chose first,' etc. [as above]. Here," continues St. Augustine, "is a passage, in which Cyprian records what we read also in Holy Scripture, that the Apostle Peter, *in whom the primacy of the Apostles shines with so excellent a grace*, was corrected by the later Apostle Paul, when he had adopted a custom in the matter of circumcision at variance with the demands of truth. If *it was, therefore, possible for Peter* in some point to walk not uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel, —if Peter, I say, could compel the Gentiles to live after the manner of the Jews, contrary to the rule of truth which the Church

afterwards held,—why might not Cyprian, in opposition to the rule of faith which the whole Church afterwards held, compel heretics and schismatics to be baptized afresh? I suppose that there is no slight to Cyprian, in comparing him with Peter, in respect to his crown of martyrdom; *rather I ought to be afraid lest I am showing disrespect towards Peter. For, who can be ignorant that the Primacy of his Apostleship is to be preferred to any episcopate in the world?*"

And, somewhat further on, referring to St. Cyprian's speech at the Council of Carthage, he says:

"Now, let the proud and swelling necks of heretics raise themselves, if they dare, against the holy humility of this address. Ye mad Donatists, whom we desire earnestly to return to the peace and unity of the Holy Church, that ye may receive health therein, what have ye to say, in answer to this? You are wont to bring up against us the letter of Cyprian, his opinion, his council; *why do you claim the authority of Cyprian for your schism, and reject his example when it makes for the unity of the Church?*"[1]

It will be seen that the point in the passage we are considering, as St. Augustine understands it, which St. Cyprian wishes to emphasize, is this: That, *although holding the Primacy*, St. Peter was so gentle and meek that, knowing himself to be in the wrong, he did not assert his superior authority in the presence of St. Paul, but humbly allowed himself to be rebuked by him, thus following the example of his Divine Master, "who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery (ἁρπαγμὸν, *a thing to be clutched at*) to be equal with God, but debased himself, taking the form of a servant."[2]

That Anglicans, the keynote of whose religion is self and self-assertion, should be unable to understand the grace of humility, is a matter of course,—we are profoundly convinced that, in the case of the extreme Ritualists, it is the one thing which holds them back from becoming Catholics,—and, consequently, when the blessed St. Cyprian extols the humility of St. Peter, in not asserting his primatial rank, they at once jump to the conclusion that he is denying the Primacy itself! Such a construction, however, is rendered impossible by the previous statement, *quem Dominus primum elegit—whom the Lord chose as Primate* (*the first of them all*),—for, since our Lord gave him the office, it was his, whether he asserted it or not.[3]

The second passage to which we will refer runs thus in the Latin:

"Episcopatus unus est cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur."

---

[1] St. Augustine. *De Baptismo contra Donatistas.* [2] Phil. ii., 6 and 7.

[3] It is scarcely necessary to say, that St. Peter was not first, in the sense of having been called first; that privilege pertained to his brother Andrew.

Considerable diversity of opinion has arisen as to the correct rendering of this passage in English; we venture to submit the following translation as, on the whole, most probably coinciding with what was in the Saint's mind:

"The Episcopate is one, a part of which is held by individuals in trust for the whole."

We do not pretend that the phrase *in trust*, for *in solidum*, by any means conveys the whole signification of that very peculiar expression. Indeed, we believe it to have a far deeper meaning. Our own impression (it may be a fanciful one) is, that the force of *in*, with the accusative, signifies that compression or attraction to a common centre which is the most intimate bond of union. Each individual holds his share in the episcopate, with a view to that intimate union with Rome, the centre of unity, which, by divine institution, is the principle of *oneness* in the Catholic Church. Thus, the episcopate is one, though composed of individuals, each of whom holds his own particular share in trust for the one episcopate—one by reason of its union with its head.

Those who regard this passage as militating against the Roman supremacy, place a variety of interpretations upon it. One, for instance, will endeavor to frame some such argument as this: If the episcopate is one, there cannot be one supreme and universal episcopate in the Roman pontiff, and another, inferior and circumscribed, in the other bishops. Doctor Murray, the late learned and accomplished Professor of Dogmatic and Moral Theology at Maynooth, in his invaluable "Treatise on the Church of Christ," disposes of this precious sophism thus:

"The interpretation of this passage is twofold. 1. The Episcopate is one in all bishops in the same way that human nature is one in all men, to wit, that in all men are those things which constitute the essentials of human nature. Just as, therefore, this unity of nature does not prevent some from excelling others in these or those accidents, such as ability, learning, authority, and so on; so, also, it does not militate against the unity of the episcopate that amongst the bishops there should be one to bear rule over the others. And, as a matter of fact, our adversaries hold that this can actually be the case without interfering with the unity of the episcopate, that some, by merely human right, should preside over others, such as formerly were the Patriarchs, and nowadays the Metropolitans. If there can be an inequality of this kind by merely human arrangement, it is not difficult to perceive how much more may this be by divine institution."[1]

It is, therefore, manifest to anyone who calmly considers the

[1] *De Ecclesia Christi*, vol. iii., p. 662.

matter, that an inequality in the *hierarchy* does not break the unity of the episcopate, or, at least, if it does so, then the unity of the episcopate has never existed at all.

Another interpretation, favored by Anglicans, is that given in the Oxford translation of St. Cyprian:

"The Episcopate is one; it is a whole in which each enjoys full possession."

This brilliant idea is thoroughly Anglican, and as illogical and untenable as are most "brilliant ideas" emanating from that source regarding these subjects. If it has any meaning at all, it signifies that every bishop, simply by virtue of his consecration, possesses universal jurisdiction, and cannot be confined within any limits whatever. If he be so confined, it is a matter of practical convenience. That tremendous potentate, the "Bishop of Gibraltar," has a perfect right to exercise his episcopal functions (and does so), both in Rome and Constantinople, whether the lawful occupants of those sees like it or not. And if his appalling jurisdiction is nominally confined to the whole of the ancient Patriarchates of Rome, Constantinople, and Alexandria, leaving that of Jerusalem (and, we presume, Antioch) to the "Bishop of the Church of England in Jerusalem," that is, simply because the powers of the above-mentioned awe-inspiring prelate are finite, and not even he can be everywhere, to exercise his universal jurisdiction at once!

For ourselves, we find it impossible to believe that St. Cyprian meant anything so preposterous as this; for, when we remember that a bishop is not merely an ordaining machine, but an officer set to govern the Church of Christ, we must surely see clearly that a thousand such governors, all endowed with plenary jurisdiction, would render all government impossible. Anglicans, surely, are the last persons to uphold such a theory, for, while they do indeed give the Bishop of Gibraltar three Patriarchates for his modest diocese, they cry out at the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster as a *schismatic!* If this theory were really true, then Novatian was no anti-Pope, but had just as much right to exercise jurisdiction in Rome as Cornelius himself.

Referring to this passage, the learned Father Ballerini says: "The episcopate is one, in the opinion of Cyprian, just as the Church is one, and therefore a part of the episcopate is held in trust for the whole by each individual bishop (*pars episcopatus in solidum tenetur ab unoquoque episcopo*), inasmuch as his own individual church is ruled by the individual, or his own particular flock, which is a part of the whole Church. But the Supreme Pontiff, the successor of St. Peter, although, *as a bishop*, he rules the particular Roman flock, yet, nevertheless, from his Primacy, by

virtue of which he presides over the whole Church, he is, according to the opinion of Cyprian, the centre and origin of the whole unity of the Church."

This interpretation of Ballerini seems, as Doctor Murray observes, to sum up the whole mind of St. Cyprian, as exemplified in all his writings, as well in the "De Unitate Ecclesiæ," as in his various treatises and epistles, in all of which he is ever the most energetic upholder of the compact organic unity of the Church. And the centre of this unity he places in Peter ("*one Church founded upon Peter, on the principle and law of unity*," Ep. lxx., *ad Januar.*),[1] and in Peter's see ("*The chief Church, whence the unity of the priesthood takes its rise*," Ep. lv., *ad Cornel.*).[2] And from Peter through the bishops it flows to the universal Church. "How firmly," says St. Cyprian, "ought we bishops, especially, who preside in the Church, to hold and defend its unity, in order that we may prove the episcopate also to be one and indivisible. Let no one deceive the brotherhood by deceit; let no one corrupt the truth of the faith by perfidious prevarication. *The episcopate is one, a part of which is held by individuals in trust for the whole.* The Church, also, is one which is spread abroad, far and wide, into a multitude by the increase of fruitfulness. Just as there are many rays of the sun, but one light, and many branches of a tree, but one strength based on its tenacious root, and since from one spring flow many streams; although the multiplicity seems diffused in the liberality of an overflowing abundance, yet the unity is still preserved in the source. Separate a ray of the sun from its body of light, its unity does not allow a division of light; break a branch from a tree, when broken it will not be able to bud; cut off the stream from its fountain, and that which is cut off dries up. Thus, also, the Church." In these words he plainly affirms the same kind of unity concerning the episcopate as he affirms concerning the Church—but not of the Church as something abstract or theoretical merely, something to be dreamed about as Anglicans dream singing

> We are not divided, (!)
> All one body we,

when they know well that the facts of the case are quite the contrary,—but as viewing it in the concrete, as something real and present, as a body of men, he declares it to be one. Other passages from the holy Bishop's writings strengthen this view, such as: "And since the one church has been divided by Christ throughout the world into many members, so the one episcopate has been

---

[1] "Una Ecclesia super Petrum origine unitatis et ratione fundatur."

[2] "Ecclesiam principalem unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est."

diffused through a harmonious multitude of many bishops," etc. (Ep. lii., *ad Anton.*) And again: "God is one, and Christ is one, and His Church is one, and the people are one, joined together *into the solid unity of the body* (*in solidum?*) by the cement of concord. Unity cannot be divided,[1] nor can a body which is one be separated by a division of its structure."

My readers will probably remember a certain famous passage in the treatise of St. Irenæus "Against Heresies"[2] relative to the Roman Church. In this passage, it is noteworthy that *necesse est* does not signify a mere moral obligation, but an absolutely unavoidable necessity, by virtue of which every church, *as a condition* of its forming part of the Church Catholic, must agree with the teaching of the Church of Rome. Precisely the same idea is present in the above words of St. Cyprian, except that he is viewing the matter from the standpoint of the Church's indissoluble unity. He declares that the Church is *one*,—one in the metaphysical sense, and he affirms and maintains the simple fact that an entity which is one *cannot be divided and yet remain one.* But inasmuch as this oneness is a divinely appointed note of the Church, it must be perpetually visible in her; therefore, he argues, the Catholic Church cannot be divided.

We think that when we consider the above passages in their entirety we cannot fail to see the utter falsity of the Oxford translation as a true rendering of St. Cyprian's words, while at the same time we are enabled to gather for ourselves his true signification. Doctor Murray paraphrases the passage thus: "The unity of the episcopate or of the bishops is the same as the unity of the Church; individual bishops indeed have their own particular shares, they rule their own flocks, but, nevertheless, in such a way that they should all unite at once in effecting an entire and solid body."

There are various other interpretations of this passage. Bouix[3] mentions three. The alternative to the one above given which Doctor Murray seems to prefer, is that set forth by Charlas, according to which St. Cyprian affirms that "a part of the episcopate is held by any bishop, not in common with others, *but alone* (or viewed as a 'corporation sole'), or so as to be the *only* bishop in his own particular diocese who should have the power of ruling, and that he himself should be the one pastor, nor should there be any other pastors," that is, having full jurisdiction, "in the same diocese."

---

[1] "Unitas scindi non potest."

[2] Book iii., ciii. "For with this Church (the Roman) on account of its more powerful principality every church must (*necesse est*) agree."

[3] De Episcopo. Part i., sect' 2, c. 4, § 2.

Now either of these renderings is perfectly consistent with St. Cyprian's words elsewhere, and with the general tenor of his whole life; the Anglican interpretation is not. We maintain, therefore, that the latter is untenable.

And now we come to the celebrated speech of St. Cyprian at the Council of Carthage. Space will not permit us to enter at length upon a detailed account of the controversy concerning which this Council was convened; the circumstances of the baptismal controversy are familiar, doubtless, to most readers of this REVIEW; suffice it to say that a widespread opinion prevailed among the African bishops that baptism was not valid outside of the Catholic Church, that is to say, that baptism administered by heretics was nugatory and required iteration. This point the Pope strenuously denied, maintaining vigorously, but not, however, *ex cathedrâ*, that every one who was baptized with the proper form, matter and intention, was *ipso facto* baptized into the Catholic Church. This doctrine was afterwards confirmed by the Œcumenical Council of Nicea.

The words under review, which form part of St. Cyprian's address to the bishops assembled in the council, at which he himself presided as primate, run as follows:

"For no one of us constitutes himself a bishop of bishops or by tyrannical terror constrains his colleagues to the necessity of obeying, since every bishop, according to the allowance of his liberty and power, has his own proper right of judgment, and can no more be judged by another than he can judge another. But let us wait for the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, one and alone, has the power of preferring us in the government of His Church, and of judging us in our conduct there."[1]

It is maintained by the opponents of the Holy See that these words constitute on the part of St. Cyprian a denial of any universal jurisdiction inherent in the Roman Pontiff, a proof, say they, that the holy bishop was either ignorant of or rejected the idea of Papal supremacy.

It has often occurred to us, when reading the words of the above passage as they lie imbedded in the *Acts* of the council, or in the shape of some smart objection from the pen of a Littledale or a Ewer, that we should like to buttonhole some mild, ingenuous Anglican (such as we knew in days of old), and force him to sit down with this passage of St. Cyprian before him, and say to him: "Now, my good honest man, just *look* at those words, read them carefully, and tell me candidly whether upon mature consideration you think that St. Cyprian *really meant* them to be understood in their *prima*

[1] Acts of the Council of Carthage.

facie literal sense. If you think that he did, then (*sit venia verbo*) you must suppose St. Cyprian to have been a fool, not only contradicting, in a moment of irritation, the principles of a lifetime, but deliberately making observations which he, and all those who heard him, must have known to be undiluted nonsense."

"No bishop can be judged by another any more than he can judge another." If by this St. Cyprian intended what you understand, what on earth did he mean by writing to Pope Stephen: "Wherefore *it behooves you* to write a very copious letter to our fellow bishops appointed in Gaul, *not to suffer* any longer that Marcianus—should insult our assembly. Let letters be directed *by you* (*a te*) into the province and to the people at Arles, *by which* (*quibus, i. e. the Pope's letters*) Marcianus being deposed, another may be substituted in his place."[1]

This Marcianus was Bishop of the Metropolitan See of Arles, generally supposed to have been situated outside the jurisdiction of the local Roman Patriarchate. He had made open cause with the Novatians, and it was for this reason that the Bishop of Carthage calls upon the Holy See to send apostolic letters deposing him from his bishopric. A peculiar commentary, certainly, upon your understanding of St. Cyprian's speech at the Council!

"But let us wait for the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, one and alone, has the power of preferring us in the government of His Church, and of judging us in our conduct there."

The *literal* signification of these words, you say, is that a bishop is utterly irresponsible, and accountable to no man for whatever actions he may choose to perform; that no one can call him to account but our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, and that not in this life.

Now, unless (we would say), our good Anglican, you have surrendered yourself entirely to fanaticism and senseless folly, we cannot believe that even you would maintain that this *could* have been St. Cyprian's real meaning. The whole of the eighty-six bishops who were assembled with him in this synod knew as a matter of daily occurrence that it was not true. They knew that our Lord Jesus Christ had *not*, personally and without any intervening human agency, perferred them in their bishoprics; they knew perfectly well, and so do you, that since our Lord's ascension this could be predicated of no one, with the possible exception of St. Paul, and even of him it is significantly told us that he went up to Jerusalem "to see Peter"; they knew perfectly well that if one of their number fell into heresy, or otherwise misbehaved himself, he was *not* left alone until he was relieved of his bishopric by death,

[1] Ep. lxvi., 2, 3. Ante-Nicene Library.

to take his stand before the tribunal of God; they knew perfectly well that some even of those very heretics whose rebaptization they were now discussing, had once been Catholic Bishops, and been deposed from their offices *by their fellow Bishops* on account of their errors in the faith. It is, therefore, manifest that, unless they thought that St. Cyprian had "lost his head," they could not have understood his words in their literal meaning, and it seems to me incredible that when you come to consider them calmly, you should do so either.

But perhaps our Anglican will reply that we have forgotten the opening words of the quotation: "Nor does any one of us constitute himself a bishop of bishops," etc. No, we do not forget it, but we fail to see what Anglicans can find in it to aid them. Surely it was the simple truth. "Cyprian," remarks Tournely,[1] "does not absolutely deny that any one is Bishop of Bishops, but merely asserts that amongst those Bishops who were sitting at this Third Council of Carthage there was no one who *makes himself* a bishop of bishops, or by tyrannical terror forces his colleagues to the necessity of obedience." This is not a mere *ad captandum* argument, as at first sight might appear. We venture to say that anyone who will take the trouble to think the matter out carefully will come to the conclusion that this *must* have been St. Cyprian's meaning. For, consider the insuparable difficulties we have to encounter if we regard these words as constituting a denial of the existence of any such office as that of bishop of bishops, a title which, we know from Tertullian, was accorded to the Roman Pontiff in the second century.[2] We have just now referred to the fact that St. Cyprian calls upon the Pope to issue *letters of deposition* against the Bishop of Arles, himself a metropolitan. Was he not in this case urging the Pope to act the part of an *episcopus episcoporum?* St. Cyprian himself, although the Primate of the Church in Africa, would scarcely have dared to *depose* one of his own suffragans without the formal sentence of his synod; but on this occasion he requests the Pope alone, by his mere letters, to remove Marcianus of Arles from his bishopric, and to order another to be appointed in his stead. Was not this calling upon him to enact the part of *episcopus episcoporum?*

Then again, how frequently he refers to the Roman See as being exalted above all other Sees, calling it the "chief church from which the unity of the priesthood has its rise;"[3] accusing Novatian of "attempting to assume the *Primacy*," and alluding[4] also to this very Pope, Cornelius, as having "ascended by all the grades of religion to the topmost summit of the priesthood."[5]

---

[1] Opera, vol. II., p. sq. [2] Tertullian, De Pudicitia, ci. [3] Ep., liv., 14.
[4] Ep., lxv., 8. [5] Ep., li., *ad Antonianum.*

We repeat, then, that unless we are prepared to make St. Cyprian contradict and stultify himsef, it is impossible to suppose that these words can be intended as a denial of that Petrine Primacy which he elsewhere so strenuously asserts.

But the words under consideration cannot be without some meaning; what must we suppose it to be? Now, we are perfectly willing to admit that it is quite possible that *indirectly* St. Cyprian did intend to make a hit at the Pope. The latter, in the exercise of his authority, had endeavored, by threats of excommunication, to recall the rebaptizing bishops from their errors. St. Cyprian knew that this point as to the rebaptization of heretics had never been formally decided by the Church, and he thought that the Pope was exceeding his authority in threatening to take extreme measures for non-acquiescence in a point not yet defined. He further thought that the Pope's private opinion was wrong. It may tend to render the matter clearer if we imagine a case at the present day. The doctrine of the assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, although it is everywhere believed by all good Catholics, has never been defined, and is not, as our readers of course know, a matter of faith. A man who denied that our Lady was assumed bodily into Heaven would not, *per se*, be regarded as a heretic. We are not saying that he would not be acting with dangerous temerity in thus maintaining his own solitary idea against the common opinion of the faithful; such a man would surely be on the verge of heresy. But let us suppose that he was not alone; that in some distant part of the world the bishops of an entire province were strongly opposed to this doctrine, denying that the tradition was sufficiently strong to warrant a definition. Let us suppose that the Pope (we do not refer to the present revered Pontiff, but any Pope) were a very strong advocate of the doctrine, and commanded (not, of course, *ex cathedrâ*) that it be taught in all the Divinity schools of that province. The bishops demur, and neglect to put the decree into execution. The Pope threatens excommunication for their disobedience, and their Primate calls together the Synod and loudly protests therein against the infringement of their episcopal rights and the abuse of the Pope's supreme authority in forcing them to teach an undefined doctrine, the evidences of which they did not accept as conclusive. And having done so, *they submit under protest.* Let us suppose that this Primate had followed the example of one Archbishop Kenrick, and had written a renowned work on "The Primacy of the Apostolic See;" does any one outside of a lunatic asylum imagine that by his action he was impugning the *lawful* rights of the Chair of Peter? Well, St. Cyprian's position was very similar to this. He was wrong,—mark that,—he and the bishops

with him *were wrong* on their point of doctrine all along, and the Pope was right, but the matter had not been decided, and it is just possible that the Pope had acted with a very little well-intentioned, but undue severity. At any rate, St. Cyprian thought that he had done so, and this is the entire explanation of this whole passage. "It is not we, brethren," he says in a meek but perhaps somewhat querulous voice to his suffragans, "it is not we who make ourselves bishops of bishops, forcing other bishops, under threats of excommunication, to accept undefined doctrines, which they believe to be incapable of definition. In matters undefined, every bishop has a right to his opinion, and ought no more to be interfered with than he has the right to interfere. These matters are not of faith, and, in my opinion, cannot be made so. Let us, then, in very charity, leave it an open question, and when the Lord Jesus Christ comes once again, and every man's work shall be tried, it will be seen who were right and who were wrong."

Such we believe to be the true signification of St. Cyprian's words. It has the advantage of being perfectly consistent with his other utterances and with all that is known of his character; whereas the Anglican interpretation, as we have shown, not only causes him to contradict his reiterated assertions, but puts words and expressions into his mouth which are absolute nonsense. Which of the two is preferable?

If it were a fixed principle that the mere fact of a man resisting the orders of another showed indubitably that he recognized in that other no authority over him, then indeed it might be necessary to adopt the Anglican view of this transaction and accept the consequences of having to charge St. Cyprian, on this occasion, with inconsistency and folly; but every one knows perfectly well that this is not so; indeed, the Ritualists are the very last persons who ought to lay down such a principle, for it would recoil with deadly force upon themselves. Why was the Rev. S. F. Green in prison for more than a year? Why was the Rev. Pelham Dale pursued even into his new home by the minions of the *Church Association*, with the intention of sequestrating his private income and ruining him a second time? We say nothing of the men who originated this persecution—they are beneath contempt; we say nothing of the judges who, by dint of wresting words from their plain and unmistakable meaning and by the falsification of documents, have sullied that spotless purity of the ermine that was once its boast. But why have these things taken place? Is it not because these gentlemen have refused to obey the orders of their respective bishops in matters regarding which they considered that the bishops were exceeding the authority which their Church had conferred upon them? And yet, we suppose that these gentlemen

would be the first to repudiate the suggestion that they denied that these bishops possessed *lawful* jurisdiction in their own dioceses, and were their canonical superiors. It is therefore manifest that objection to the orders of a superior is not equivalent *per se* to denying his rightful jurisdiction; and inasmuch as St. Cyprian has in many cases, preëminently in that of Marcianus of Arles, affirmed this superiority of jurisdiction in the Roman Pontiff, we have no right to suppose that he was here objecting to anything but what he conceived to be an abuse of power. When one looks calmly and dispassionately at St. Cyprian's words on this occasion, one sees that there is not a syllable which impugns the Papal authority, but simply the Pope's *mode of action* in this particular instance.

There is one other point in this connection to which we should like to call the attention of the reader, for we think it is very significant. There were eighty-seven bishops present at the Council, and *they all spoke.* They were all trying to prove a certain error to be right, and some of them, we are sorry to say, talked great nonsense. But there is this much about it. According to the Anglican idea, the Bishop of Rome, a simple *primus inter pares*, had insolently presumed in violation of decency and courtesy to issue orders to his equals, and to claim an authority which was before unknown in the Church. Now, if this were so, is it not an extraordinary thing that all these eighty-six excited bishops, omitting St. Cyprian,—that they all spoke, many of them most vehemently and unadvisedly, upon the subject of baptism, but not a single one of them made the slightest reference to the Pope or his usurpations? One would have thought they would have been full of it; one would have supposed that some widespread agitation, such as that which astonished the Catholics of England at the restoration of the hierarchy, would have manifested itself, and that clergy and laity would have banded themselves into one indignant phalanx to resist the aggressions of Rome. That is, doubtless, in the opinion of British Protestantism, what they ought to have done. This picture, so dear to the heart of an Exeter Hall speaker, is marred by a single flaw,—they did nothing of the sort! The only bishop present who by his words can be supposed to have had the Pope in his mind at all is St. Cyprian himself; but we have already seen that the words which he uses are perfectly capable of an interpretation which, while it undoubtedly intimates a feeling of irritation at what he supposed to be a stretch of the primatial authority, yet is entirely consistent with his other pro-

[1] Those who desire to read a full account of the proceedings at this Council, with a report of all the speeches, will find it in the second volume of St. Cyprian's works, in the Ante-Nicene Library.

nouncements, affirmative of that power; while, on the other hand, they can only be construed into a denial of the Petrine supremacy by resolving them into a mass of self-contradiction and absolutely unmeaning nonsense.

The fourth and last quotation from St. Cyprian's works to which we would call attention is as follows:

"Certainly the other apostles were as Peter was, in an equal partnership both of honor and power, but a beginning is made from unity that the Church may be set forth as one."[1]

It may be argued that, inasmuch as the whole *rationale* of the Primacy consists in the honor and power peculiar to it, if St. Peter did not possess a dignity and power which was wanting to the other apostles, he was not Primate at all. But according to the passage under consideration, they were all equal in honor and power. Here again is that same confusion of ideas to which Anglicans are so prone. The apostles *were* all equal *as regards their apostolate*, just as all bishops are equal as bishops, and all priests as priests. The Constitution of the United States declares that "all men are created equal." This means that *as men* they have the same political rights, but it is not intended to signify that the President, or the State Governors, or the judges and other magistrates, are not superior in their official capacity. And so likewise, that the apostles were not all equal to St. Peter in those peculiar offices and privileges which our Lord in the Gospel conferred on him *alone*, and not on the others, must surely be plain to every student of the Bible. And this passage from St. Cyprian, so far from weakening this distinction, very strongly confirms it, if we take it with the preceding context as it is thus given in Bishop Fell's edition. "Super unum ædificat ecclesiam suam. Et *quamvis* Apostolis omnibus parem protestatem tribuat et dicat, 'sicut missit me Pater,' etc.,—*tamen* ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis ejusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erant *utique* et ceteri Apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio prædíti et honoris et potestatis, *sed* exordium ab unitate proficiscitur ut Ecclesia una monstretur." "Upon one He builds His Church. And *although* He attributes an equal power to all the apostles, and says 'as the Father hath sent me', etc., *nevertheless*, in order that He might manifest unity, He made, by His own authority, the origin of that same unity to begin from one. *Assuredly* the other apostles were what Peter was, endowed with a like partnership of honor and power, *but* the beginning proceeds from unity that the Church may be set forth as one."

Now, if the reader will carefully examine this passage, he will

[1] *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, 4.

observe that the words printed in *italics* are *antithetical:* quamvis—tamen, utique—sed; and this fact must be taken into consideration in order fully to grasp St. Cyprian's meaning. He affirms two things: first, that our Lord made all the Apostles equal in the common offices of the ministry,—absolving from sin, teaching, etc., and also in those privileges which were necessary to their apostolate as founders of this Church,—and that they were altogether equal in exercising those offices; *but,* since our Lord decreed that the Church should be compactly and perpetually *one,* therefore, secondly, *although* they were equal in the before-mentioned offices, *nevertheless* that Christ, for the purpose of effecting and preserving that unity, had accorded to St. Peter another office, peculiarly and individually his own, namely, to be the *root* and *preserver* of this unity. This twofold office is certainly implied in St. Cyprian's words: "Upon that one (Peter) He builds His Church, and to him He assigns His sheep to be fed."[1] The two things are necessarily coördinate. For our Lord to have made him the root and not the preserver of the unity of the Church would have been simply to stultify the office He was conferring upon him, and render it abortive. For the unity of the Church is not a mere ornament, but is, by our Lord's institution, that *visible note* by which she is to be known to all men. To place, then, the *origin* of that unity in an individual as being a necessary means of setting forth that the Church is one, and not to make an individual the perpetual centre of that unity, is something which, to our mind, is inconceivable. It is providing for the ornamental, and leaving the essential and necessary unprovided for. To maintain this is to assert that our Lord imposed the obligation of unity, but withheld from the Church the means of preserving it. For there is no conceivable means by which a multitude of beings, endowed with free will, can be preserved in unity, except by union with a common head.

We have chosen the above four excerpts from St. Cyprian's works for consideration, because it has been urged by Anglicans that they "considerably modify" those passages from his writings upon which Catholics rely. We trust, however, that we have shown clearly enough that, taken in the Anglican sense, they do not "modify," but deprive them of all meaning whatever. The Anglican interpretation can only be upheld at the expense of St. Cyprian's reputation for truthfulness, consistency, and common sense. In order to maintain their own sinful and schismatical position, they are willing to make a catspaw of this glorious martyr and confessor, holding him up to public obloquy as a man weakminded and selfcontradicting, losing his head and his temper at a public meeting, and using words and making statements which

[1] *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, 4.

he himself and every one else knew to be both contrary to facts and foolish in themselves.

"Cease, then," says St. Augustine, "to bring forward against us the authority of Cyprian—but cling with us to the example of Cyprian for the preservation of unity. For this question of baptism has not been, as yet, completely worked out,"—not defined,—"but yet the Church observed the most wholesome custom of correcting what was wrong, not repeating what was already given, even in the case of schismatics and heretics; she healed the wounded part, but did not meddle with what was whole. Cyprian and his colleagues, though they believed," as an *opinion*, "that heretics and schismatics did not possess baptism, yet chose rather to hold communion with them when they had been received into the Church without baptism, than be separated from the unity of the Church, according to the words of Cyprian, 'judging no one, nor depriving any one of the right of communion, if he differ from us.' It is no small proof of a most peaceful soul, that he won the crown of martyrdom in that unity from which he would not separate, even though he differed from it."

It will be seen that, in the above passage, St. Augustine plainly implies (as we, following the holy Doctor, have done) that St. Cyprian, on the occasion we have referred to, was simply maintaining the right possessed by every Catholic theologian to retain his own opinion in matters which have not been defined as of faith.

As a matter of fact, the mind of St. Cyprian was far too keen and logical to allow him to fall into any such quagmire of inconsistency as that in which Anglicans find themselves. If there is one doctrine above all others to whose defence and elucidation he brought all the arts of learning and eloquence, it was that relating to the *indissoluble nature of the visible unity of the Church.* "The divine Scripture," says he, "teaches that the Church cannot be rent in parts or divided, but maintains the unity of an indivisible, individual house."[1] And throughout the whole of that masterpiece of his pen, the treatise "On the Unity of the Church," the same idea of the absolute impossibility of the Church being divided, because, as we have already seen, union with the *visible head* was the *sine qua non* of Church membership, is luminously present. "Does he," he cries, "who does not hold *this* unity of the Church, think that he holds the faith? Does he who strives against and resists the Church, trust that he is in the Church?"[2] And then, as a rebuke to those who pretend that corruptions and sinfulness among her members can possibly defile the Church herself, or constitute an excuse for violating her unity, he goes on:

"The Spouse of Christ cannot be adulterous; she is uncorrupted

---

[1] *Ep.*, lxix., 4. [2] *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, 4.

and pure. She knows one home; she guards with chaste modesty the sanctity of one couch. She keeps us for God. She appoints the sons whom she has borne for the kingdom. Whoever is separated from the Church is joined to an adulteress, is separated from the promises of the Church. Nor can he who forsakes the Church attain to the rewards of Christ. He is a stranger, he is profane, he is an enemy. He can no longer have God for his Father who has not the Church for his mother. If any one could escape who was outside the ark of Noah, then he also may escape who shall be outside of the Church. The Lord warns, saying: 'He who is not with Me is against Me, and he who gathereth not with Me scattereth.' He who breaks the peace and the concord of Christ, does so in opposition to Christ; he who gathereth elsewhere than in the Church scatters the Church of Christ. The Lord says, 'I and the Father are One;' and again, it is written of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, 'And these three are one.' And does any one believe that the unity which thus comes from the divine strength, and coheres in celestial sacraments, can be divided in the Church, and can be separated by the parting asunder of opposing wills? He who does not hold THIS UNITY does not hold God's law, does not hold the faith of the Father and the Son, and does not hold life and salvation."[1]

We have already seen what it is that St. Cyprian means by "this unity," *viz.*, a solid, compact, visible unity; a oneness alike in doctrine and government, brought about by the intimate union of all the bishops with the "throne of Peter, the chief Church, whence priestly unity takes its source."[2] This was the leading idea in his mind, and the principle upon which he acted in all his controversies with schismatics. Nor is this fact disputed by impartial Protestants like Neander and Mosheim, who, having nothing to gain for their own particular sects by putting, as do Anglicans, a forced construction upon his words, are willing to concede to them their plain signification. The former tells us that St. Cyprian "looked upon the Roman Church as really the 'Cathedra Petri,' and the representative of the outward unity of the Church;" while Mosheim, good man, in the innocence of his invincible ignorance, thinks that "Cyprian and the rest cannot have known the corollaries which follow from their precepts about the Church (!). For no one is so blind as not to see that between a certain unity of the Universal Church terminating in the Roman Pontiff, and such a community as we have described out of Irenæus and Cyprian, there is scarcely so much room as between hall and chamber, or between hand and fingers."[3]

---

[1] *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, 4. Ante-Nicene Library translation.

[2] *Ep.*, liv., 14. Ante-Nicene Library translation.

[3] Allnatt. *Cat' Petri*, p. 62.

But the martyred Bishop of Carthage was by no means so wanting in logical acumen as the worthy historian would imagine him to be; his actions, as we have seen in the case of Marcianus of Arles (*ex pede Herculem*), show that he was perfectly alive to the consequences of his cherished theory, that he accepted it explicitly, and was fully prepared to submit to the results in his own person, even as he inculcated it in others. How keenly, therefore, do those words of St. Augustine, which we have before quoted, come home to us throughout the whole of this controversy! With what marvellous fitness does his rebuke to the Donatists apply to those who in our own day would endeavor to shield their miserable schism under the great name of St. Cyprian; "You are wont to bring up against us the letter of Cyprian, his opinion, his council; why do ye claim the authority of Cyprian for your schism, and reject his example, when it makes for the unity of the Church?"

A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF FATHER ROBERT MOLYNEUX, S. J.

DURING our great Revolutionary struggle the calm old Quaker City on the Delaware was a place of intense excitement and momentous historic interest. It could be truly said that throughout the whole War of Independence "the eyes of the world were upon it." There all the talent, wisdom, wealth, and patriotism of the Colonial chiefs and sages could be found in grave and deliberate council, in Carpenter's Hall, or in the venerated chambers of the old State House. Even those who did not make it a study, or one of the chief objects of their lives, to see great and illustrious men, from time to time, saw on the streets a George Washington or a Charles Carroll of Carrollton. Philosophers, statesmen, and literary characters could be met in every nook and corner of the "city of marble steps," engaged in thinking, in planning, or in writing. Warlike bodies, with banners waving, sabres bristling, and drums beating, paraded hourly the streets or squares of the once placid retreat of the peace-loving disciples of George Fox.

Among those who helped to change materially the aspect of Penn's City were the brave French officers who had chivalrously

sailed away from the fair land of France to strike a blow for America's independence. These lent the beautiful forest of houses on the Delaware a more than ordinary air of polish and refinement. They threw into the meditative and sedate society of Philadelphia a good deal of that gayety and sprightliness so common in some of the cities of their native land. It was impossible even for a Quaker City to remain dull, or in frozen tranquillity, in the gay presence of a Luzerne, a Rochambeau, a De Fleury, a La Touche, a De Melfort.

It must be admitted even by their most ardent admirers that all the French patriots were not as perfect Christians as could be wished; but still, many of them were, even in the camp, as pious and as faithful to their religious duties and devotions as when, years before, they studied in the Jesuit schools of Paris, or knelt with clasped hands by their mothers' sides in the Church of Saint Denis, or in the famed Cathedral of Notre Dame.

The foreign Catholic officers in Philadelphia were inevitably exposed to great temptations and dangers. They had come from a land, such as Poland or France, that had been hallowed by the footprints of saints. They had left behind them a land where all their surroundings inspired them with love and veneration for our holy Religion, though for the time it was bitterly attacked by the infidel and the impious scoffer. The venerated old churches and schools and monasteries and convents and graveyards, at home, spoke to them of the ancient and cherished Faith of their "stout crusading fathers" who "fought and died for God, and not for gold." In Philadelphia they found themselves in the midst of a non-Catholic people who looked down with contempt upon the creed of "papists," though they did not despise the keenness of their ready swords, or the telling force and power of their bullet-arguments. Frequently they had to associate with men like Tom Paine, or worse still, perhaps, with characters like Benjamin Franklin, "Provincial Grand Master of Pennsylvania," who had, it is said, but "a cold approbation for the morals" of the Divine Redeemer of mankind.

But, fortunately, the Catholic officers in Philadelphia were not altogether abandoned to the temptations and seductions that surrounded them. They had a valued friend and counsellor in one who was a great and trusted favorite among them, in a Jesuit who resided at the "Little Church down the Alley," as old St. Joseph's is familiarly called. In all their trials and troubles this good priest was ready to assist them. He showed them the unfading beauty of virtue, the worth of steadfast faith, the consolations of hope grounded on truth. He refuted the vain arguments of error, showed how hollow and fleeting are the joys of this life, and pointed out to

them with a finger of light the true path to peace, to happiness, to glory. He mingled with them on every suitable occasion, and made himself all to all. He visited them in their camps, which were pitched along the shores of the Delaware, said mass for them, preached to the French in the sweet tongue of Fénélon and Bossuet, and gave them the Benediction of the Immaculate Lamb. And many a one of them, before the stirring blast of the war-trumpet sounded in his ear, knelt piously and humbly at the Jesuit's knees and afterwards received the Bread of Life from his hands; and then, with strength and courage from Heaven, marched nobly out "to conquer or to die." These brave soldiers, indeed, conquered. Their arms were victorious. But not a few of them died with the shout of victory on their lips. And then their Jesuit friend and father, while sorrow filled his heart, and tears, perhaps, bedewed his eyes, blessed the fallen heroes' graves, and chanted for their souls the Requiem Mass. The Jesuit Father to whom we refer was none other than that worthy son of St. Ignatius, the Rev. Father Robert Molyneux.

Father Molyneux was a man of much refinement and taste, one who would be an ornament in any society. He was gifted with rare conversational powers, and was one of the most polished and thrilling orators that ever made a Philadelphia church, or hall, ring with fervid and lofty eloquence. Though but few of the sermons of Father Molyneux have been printed, still the voice of tradition proclaims him a man endowed with most of the qualities requisite for the making of a great public speaker. He had a ready command of rich, choice language, a deep insight into human nature, and he felt the dignity and importance of his mission as an apostle of the Word. His voice was full, clear, and pleasant. When preaching to his flock, there was inspiration in his words and whole appearance. On the death of Father Ferdinand Farmer, *vere* Steinmeyer,[1] in August, 1786, a great grief fell upon the Catholics of Philadelphia. The learning and virtue of this holy man were the joy and consolation of his people. His zeal and humility won the admiration even of those who did not belong to the true fold.

[1] "Father Farmer," according to Oliver, "was born in Suabia the 13th of October, 1720. He entered the Jesuit Novitiate at Landsperge at the age of 23. United to the English Province, he was sent to the Maryland Mission, where, Dr. Carroll said, 'he did much good until his death, the 17th of August, 1786.'" "His learning and other commendable qualifications," says Father Molyneux, "soon drew public notice." Hence, without seeking the honor, he was admitted, by the suffrages of a learned acquaintance, a member of the Philosophical Society. To his correspondence with Father Myers, late astronomer to the Elector Palatine, now Duke of Bavaria, that Society is indebted for some curious pieces of that celebrated mathematician on the transit of Venus, dedicated to the Empress of Russia. Father Farmer was also a member of the Board of Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania, and was loved and esteemed by Benjamin West, and other celebrities of his time."

When his mortal remains were brought to the "New Chapel"—St. Mary's Church—the citizens of Philadelphia came in vast numbers to prove their love and veneration for him. Father Molyneux preached a touching funeral sermon over his dead brother-priest. After speaking of the learning and "other commendable qualifications" of the departed, he said: "Such has been the man whose remains are before us; while, therefore, we are assembled to pay the last tribute of our regard and affection to his memory, and drop the mournful tear on his funeral tomb, let us not indulge ourselves in unreasonable grief, nor be sorrowful like those who are without hope. He is gone but a little while before us, and points, by edifying example and faithful instructions, to the way we must follow him.

"Let the remembrance of these be renewed on this awful occasion, and so deeply impressed on your hearts and minds as never to be effaced. They will be unto you a surviving guide through the walks of virtue into which he has directed you; they will be as the polar star, by which you may safely steer to the port of eternal bliss, to which we hope he is himself arrived. His voice is no longer to be heard from this chair of truth from which he so frequently and so fervently delivered those lessons to you. His hands are no longer lifted up at that altar to offer sacrifice and supplications in behalf of his cherished flock. The thresholds of your houses are no longer frequented by those graceful steps which he so often made to bring tidings of peace and good greeting of salvation to your ears. He can no longer, with his accustomed and sincere good will for your eternal welfare, invite you to come and partake of those pledges of reconciliation with your God and drink at those fountains of life which flow so plentifully from the loving Heart of Jesus."

Father Molyneux was a large man in every respect—in heart, in frame, in mind, and in soul. He was one of those of whom it could be said—"Nature's nobility sat on his brow." He was such a man as those who follow the path of glory and the smoke and fire of battles would naturally love and admire. This is proved by the fact that he was the idol not only of the French and Polish officers, but also of the chiefs and soldiers of the famous "Irish Brigade" of the Pennsylvania Line.

Among the distinguished Catholic gentlemen who attended St. Joseph's Church during the rectorship of Father Molyneux were Thomas Fitzsimmons, an "extensive merchant," of Philadelphia, who, during the revolution, commanded a volunteer company and was for a long time engaged in active service; General Stephen Moylan, brother of the Bishop of Cork. "Moylan," says Thomas D'Arcy McGee, "after being aide-de-camp to Washington and

commissary-general, was finally transferred to the command of the Dragoons; and in almost every severe action of the war where cavalry could operate, we meet with the fearless 'Moylan's Dragoons.'" Matthew Carey, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, and Commodore John Barry, who has been called, by naval writers, "The Father of the American Navy," were also attendants at St. Joseph's, and were, no doubt, on intimate terms with Father Molyneux.

One of the great ends of the Society of Jesus is to educate youth, and to instil into their minds and hearts a love of solid virtue and religion. Father Molyneux, even after the Suppression of his Order, kept this end constantly in view. He was always a strenuous and uncompromising advocate of religious education. He was thoroughly imbued with the impression that children should at all times, and in all places, be trained in virtuous ways, and that from their most tender years they should be taught the sublime lessons of morality and religion. He was the founder, the friend, the protector of one of the first Catholic schools opened in Philadelphia.[1]

---

[1] One hundred years ago, though there were two chapels, St Joseph's and St. Mary's, there was but one congregation, parish, or mission. As early as 1781 Father Molyneux, remembering the importance of educating the young for heaven, while their minds are being prepared for the duties of life, had his parochial school erected. He knew that the hearts and minds of parents could be more easily gained through the affection and careful training of their children. At what precise date a Catholic School was first opened in Philadelphia, we are not prepared to say, but it was prior to 1781; for in the subscription list of that year mention is made of the "Old" and of building the "New School-house."

This school-house connected with St. Joseph's and St. Mary's, then under the same management, was situated north of St. Joseph's, in the rear of what is now Cochran's wholesale wine house. The masters had to instruct six pupils free and receive pay for all others. The affairs of school, as of church temporalities, were seen to by "Managers" until September, 1788, when St. Mary's was incorporated, and the affairs were in the hands of trustees. On September 1st, 1783, the managers agreed to give the children premiums to the value of twenty shillings, four times a year, for improvement in studies.

If we consider the difficulties that encumbered our Fathers, the location of the church and school house, we must acknowledge that the work of Father Molyneux to build a Catholic school in 1781, ere the warm feelings caused by the Revolution had ceased, in the hot-bed of prejudice, within a short walk of Penn Park, and within a stone's throw of the Quaker Almshouse, was an arduous task.

As the many flourishing and stately churches, which are now the pride of Philadelphia, have sprung from St. Joseph's humble beginnings, so the magnificent and costly Seminary of St. Charles, at Overbrook, took its rise from the ruins of the "Old school-house." The first attempt at an ecclesiastical seminary for the diocese was in the residence of Bishop Conwell, the old St. Joseph's residence. Among the students were Michael Keenan* of Lancaster, Penn., and John Hughes, afterwards Archbishop of New York.†

When Bishop Kenrick was appointed administrator of the diocese, he also had a

* Died a few years ago, having been parish priest in Lancaster over fifty years.

† He finished his education in Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmittsburg, Mt.

He may, indeed, be considered the Father of Religious Education in this city.

As a missionary and pastor, the labors of Father Molyneux were arduous, incessant, and fruitful. Many a poor wandering soul he led back into the ways of penance, many a noble Christian soul he faithfully guided up the steep and rugged paths of perfection. There was a time when he and another brother Jesuit were the only priests in Philadelphia. On these two devolved the sacred duty of attending not only to the wants of the Catholics around them, but also to the needs of those of the Household of Faith who were scattered on the mountains of Pennsylvania, in the wooded fields of New Jersey, and even on the banks of the Hudson. His eloquent pen and tongue were the joy of his people and the terror of the enemies of the Church which he loved and served with all the devotion of his heart.

Father Molyneux was, for a time, Professor of English to some of the more distinguished Frenchmen who resided in Philadelphia during the days of the Continental Congress. Among those whom he initiated into the mysteries and beauties of our language was the Chevalier de la Luzerne.

In all the grand Catholic religious services held in Philadelphia during the War of Independence, Father Molyneux was sure to be, if not the central figure, at least a prominent one. For some years later, too, he was always conspicuous in Catholic ceremonies and meetings. "On the 25th of August, 1781, the birthday of the King of France, Louis XVI., was celebrated at St. Joseph's, with much pomp. The French Minister was present at Mass, his musicians accompanying the organ, and some of the gentlemen of his household singing. L'Abbé Bandal was celebrant." On this important occasion, the orator of the day was Father Molyneux.

Father Molyneux was a ripe scholar. In one of the old Jesuit colleges, on the European Continent, he laid the solid foundations of a deep and varied store of learning. And so great was his knowledge that he himself was appointed Professor of Philosophy at Bruges, in Belgium. While Pastor of St. Joseph's, Philadelphia, he helped, materially, his illustrious pupil, Archbishop Carroll, in his various controversies—by references to books, and even by his own notes and points.

By birth, as well as by education, Father Molyneux was a thor-

---

kind of seminary in his residence—first in Fifth street below Powell,—afterwards on the east side of Fifth street below Prune, close to St. Mary's graveyard.

But the first ecclesiastical seminary, of any pretensions as a seminary, was located in an old building in the rear of the pastoral residence of St. Mary's Church, whence it was transferred to the northeast corner of Eighteenth and Race streets, and later to Overbrook.

ough gentleman. He was descended from a high and distinguished line of ancestors. Many of those who were of near kin to him had become famous for their devotion to the oppressed cause of the Old Religion. He had a brother who, like himself, had followed the standard of Ignatius Loyola. Born at Formby, County Lancaster, England, on the 24th of July, 1738, he witnessed, in his youth, the direful workings of the cruel Penal Code. But the animosity of the enemies of the grand old Roman Creed only made it dearer to him, only made him prize it the more. The pictures hanging on the walls of his ancestral chambers inspired him with generous and lofty sentiments, and kindled in his youthful heart a deep and lasting reverence for the ancient Faith of his venerable forefathers. Being sent, while still a mere boy, to one of the Catholic continental colleges, he early mingled in the society of confessors of the Faith from Ireland and his own unhappy country. From these he caught that spark of apostolic fire that ever after burned in his heart. Amid the sufferings, the unheard-of sufferings, of the Catholic Church in England, he witnessed the continual labor and the heroic sacrifices of the Brothers of St. Francis Xavier, and he learned to love and admire them. While on the Continent, he had them as teachers, as advisers, as spiritual fathers, and he grew to love them, and he longed to imitate them. In his nineteenth year, full of life, and talent, and promise, he, wisely and gladly, and with a generous spirit, turned away from the pleasures and seductions of a false and deceitful world, and entered a humble Jesuit Novitiate. We may easily fancy the holy life he led while a novice. He fully appreciated the value and importance of an interior life, "from which," as St. Ignatius says, "force must flow to the exterior." We well know that no man but a spiritual man could become a true apostle, or render any great service in God's Church. In his sermon on the death of Father Farmer we find the following passage, which may well be applied to himself: "There is yet," he says, after speaking of the public life of the deceased, "a hidden treasure laid up in heaven, unseen and unknown to the world, but highly precious before God, who knows the inward man, and searches our reins and hearts. Those scenes of silent contemplation on heavenly truths and secret conversations with God Himself, to whom he daily poured forth his pious soul in ecstasies of love and raptures of admiration of the Divine perfections! Could the humble cell of his late habitation but relate what passed in these moments, it would go far beyond what you have yet heard or seen! These are those inward beauties of the righteous soul: those springs which impart life and action to all that outwardly appears so zealous and virtuous, and imprints the stamp of solid worth and merit. These will be found to shine as

no inferior ornaments in the celestial crown. View him, in fine, through private or public life, you will not find him swerving from that golden device of the institute of his order—the greater glory of God."

Since the "Pilgrims," under the favor of Lord Baltimore, sailed in the Dove and Ark up the waters of the Potomac, in 1634, until the suppression of the Society of Jesus, in 1773, the Maryland Mission was confided to the care of the English Jesuit Province. The Fathers came thence, in almost unbroken succession, to labor ardently and heroically for the salvation of the settlers, Indians and slaves on the shores of the Chesapeake, and on the banks of the Potomac and Patuxent rivers. And their labors were blessed, and crowned with success; for, even in our day, the descendants of the Maryland Pilgrims, not only in the southern part of "Terra Mariæ," but also in many other portions of the United States, still cling with love and veneration to that Church, of which Fathers White, Altham, Fisher and Copley were apostles. Soon after his elevation to the priesthood, Father Molyneux was sent on the Maryland Mission.

After leaving Philadelphia, Father Molyneux was sent to take charge of the mission of "Bohemia Manor." Before him the Jesuit missionaries had labored in Cecil County, Maryland, in which the Manor is situated, for almost a whole century. We know not how it came to pass that the Jesuit residence became synonymous with the *Bohemia Manor*, for, in reality, they were distinct and separate homes. Perhaps, it is because the Jesuit property, in the course of time, included some of the Manor estate. The original Bohemia Manor, as we see from an old document before us, was taken possession of by Augustine Herman, in "*October, Anno Domini One Thousand Six Hundred Sixty and Three.*" It included about four thousand acres of good land, and two thousand acres of "Swamps, Barrens and Pocosons." In 1704, Father Thomas Mansell built a church and residence not far from the Great Bohemia Manor. After him came, as successors, Fathers Peter Atwood, Thomas Poulton, Joseph Greaton, John Lewis, Joseph Mosley, Matthias Manners, John Bolton, and many other early Jesuit missionaries. All these priests left behind them marks of apostolic zeal.

Father Molyneux was faithful to the bright and glorious example set by his predecessors. Everywhere in Cecil County he helped to extend the Kingdom of Christ, to perfect the work of those holy men who had gone before him. He did not confine his apostolic excursions to the adjacent villages, but wandered frequently, in his zeal, through many parts of Delaware, to strengthen and console the few Catholic families who lived in that State.

In an old document, dated October 3d, 1793, we find the names of Rev. Mr. Walton, Rev. Mr. Molyneux, Rev. Mr. Ashton. Besides these names we find, *Declaration of Property.* The Declaration of Father Molyneux is as follows: "I, Robert Molyneux, of the County of Montgomery, and State of Maryland, do, by virtue of these presents, make known, publish, and declare, in conformity and agreeably to an Act of Assembly of the State of Maryland, entitled, 'An Act for securing certain Estates and property for the support and uses of the Ministers of the Roman Catholic religion,' that the Real property hereafter specified, viz.: A Tract of Land, known by the name of St. Joseph's, lying in Talbot County, containing two hundred and seven acres and a half, more or less, hath been and now is held by me under a confidential or implied trust for the use, benefit, and maintenance of the ministers of the Roman Catholic Church now exercising their Ministerial Functions within the United States of America, agreeably to the Rules and discipline of their Church, and who were formerly members of the Religious Society heretofore known by the name of the Society of Jesus. In testimony whereof, I hereunto set my hand and seal, this third day of October, Anno Domini one thousand seven hundred and ninety-three. Robert Molyneux [seal.]"

After leaving Bohemia, Father Molyneux went to Georgetown; but, further on, we will refer to his stay at that college. In 1797 he arrived in Newtown Manor, St. Mary's County, Maryland. This ancient Jesuit residence, situated beautifully on a neck of rich land between St. Clement's and Britton's Bay, and bounded on the south by the Potomac, is one of the oldest and most important of the Jesuit houses in Maryland. Its history is one of peculiar interest. The manor was taken possession of as early as 1639, by William Britton, a brave soldier of St. Inigoes' Fort, and one highly distinguished in the annals of southern Maryland. We know not at what precise period the first chapel was built at Newtown, but we are certain that one was built there in 1661. In 1668, the Newtown estate was purchased by Father Henry Warren, *alias* Pelham, for forty thousand pounds of tobacco. The present church[1] at Newtown, St. Francis Xavier's, was built by Father James Ashby, *alias* Middlehurst, in 1767. We have seen Father Molyneux among the gay French officers of Philadelphia; we may now see him in other company. He who thrilled the *élite* of that city may now be heard pouring forth his tides of sacred eloquence within the narrow walls of a little country chapel. In place of officers and men of distinguished civic rank, in place of literary men, he now addresses the humble tillers of the soil and a few fishermen.

[1] The bell of this church was cast in London, in 1691. It may be of interest to remark that the bell at St. Inigoes is older still, having been cast in 1682.

Though in St. Mary's county there could have been found, at the period of which we write, many Catholic gentlemen and ladies of education and refinement, still those with whom the priest had most to do, on account of their wants, sorrows, and trials, were the poor and the slaves. In the hovels of the poor, and in the quarters of the slaves, then, Father Molyneux could be found for the greater part of eight long years. It was a most edifying and touching sight to see Molyneux, the scion of an illustrious family, a professor of Bruges, a noted orator in a polished city, a scholar of varied attainments, visiting daily the poor sick slaves who were confined to their lowly beds in the dark rooms of their old log-cabins. Oh, the zeal of apostolic men! Oh, the charity of the Religion of Christ!

The Society of Jesus, suppressed in 1773, was reëstablished in this country in 1805. Some of the ex-members of that Order immediately renewed their vows of religion with a holy joy. These were soon joined by a devoted band of Jesuits from White Russia. The virtue of Father Molyneux was well known to all Jesuits, and his learning and prudence had long been appreciated by them. It was, therefore, no surprise to any of them when they heard that he had been appointed Superior of all his brethren in the Mission of Maryland.

Father Molyneux was no ordinary man. He stands out before us as a great and good man. He was an ornament in the Church and an honor to the Order to which he belonged. Through the dim records of our history we see in him a character to be loved and revered, one of the pure members of the royal Christian Priesthood. As a pastor, or missioner, he endeared himself to his flock; as Superior of a religious Order, he won the confidence and affection of his subjects by his sweetness and his kind and affable manner.[1] On account of his learning, zeal for souls, and his solid virtue, he may well be considered one of the chief glories of the Catholic clergy in this country. "His," wrote a Philadelphia clergyman a few years ago, "was an eventful life; his it was to instruct the first Archbishop of Baltimore in Philosophy; his it was to direct St. Joseph's congregation when it no longer made a man a pariah to be a Catholic, but even a Quaker thought Catholic influence of sufficient importance to be courted—in the early days of the Revolutionary struggle. Father Molyneux was pastor, with Father Farmer as assistant, during the whole Revolutionary War, and also in 1781, when a solemn service of Thanksgiving was offered

[1] Father Anthony Kohlmann wrote to the distinguished Father William Strickland, in 1807: "Nôtre digne Père Superieur, le R. P. Molyneux, demeure dans la maison du Novitiat, et possède la confiance et l'affection de tous par la bonté de son cœur et la gaieté de son humeur, qu'il conserve toujours dans son heureuse vieillesse."

to Almighty God for the assistance rendered by the French to the struggling Colonies."

Father Molyneux was not the first Jesuit who labored for the Faith in the midst of the Philadelphia Friends. As early as 1686 Mass was occasionally said in some private house on the banks of the Delaware. This was only four years after William Penn had founded his city. The name assumed by the zealous missionary who, in 1686, read Mass in the new town "bounded by the two rivers, Delaware and Schuylkill, and on the north and south by Vine and Cedar streets, was *John Smith.* This priest, who labored for some time both on the Eastern and Western Shores of Maryland, is identical with Father Henry Harrison,[1] who was, for some time, in Fort William, New York, during the governorship of the distinguished Catholic, Colonel Thomas Dongan. In the "Documentary History of New York," we have the following reference to this priest: "There was a cry that all images erected by Colonel Thomas Dongan on the fort should be broken down and taken away; but when we were working in the fort with others, it was commanded, after the departure of Sir Edmond Andros, by said Nicholson, to help the priest John Smith to remove, for which we were very glad, but was soon done, because said removal was not far off, but in a little room in the fort, and ordered to make all things for said priest according to his will and perfectly, and to erect all things as he ordered from that time." We learn from a letter of Jacob Leisler, that during the Protestant revolution of 1689, some of the distinguished Catholics of southern Maryland were at Philadelphia. Leisler writes from the "Fort" of New York: "It is 3 weeks agoe that I heard of some of your papist grandees to be at Philadelphia." Among these Maryland "papist grandees" were several of the old friends of Father Harrison. We may reasonably suppose that he went to Philadelphia to see them, and attend to their spiritual needs. There can scarcely be a doubt concerning the visits of the Jesuit missionaries, Harvey[2] and Gage,

[1] In 1686, there were three Jesuits in New York, Fathers Charles Gage, Thomas Harvey, and Henry Harrison. About 1687, Father Gage returned to England; for we find him at Norwich in 1688, the year of the Orange Revolution. In 1689, there remained only two Jesuits at New York, Harvey and Harrison. As Harvey was known by the *alias*, Thomas Barton, his companion, Harrison, must certainly be the *priest John Smith* alluded to at this very time in the "Documentary History of New York."

[2] In the "History of the Catholic Church on the Island of New York," also in the "Catholic Church in the United States" and in the "History of Philadelphia," it is stated that Father Harvey died in 1719. With all due regard for the authority of the learned authors of these works, we would venture to say here that we believe this to be a mistake. In the Catalogues of the Society, kept at the Gesu, in Rome, Father Harvey is said to have died in 1696. This is also asserted in the "English Records," edited by Br. Henry Foley, S. J.

to Philadelphia between the years 1686 and 1688. The few Catholics in New York were not able to satisfy the zeal of these missionaries, and so, from time to time, they made excursions to Amboy, where, according to Leisler, there was "a company of papists and popishly affected people;" to Burlington, where there were some very wealthy Catholics; and, we may suppose, also to Philadelphia. From catalogues before us, we see that the New York Jesuits frequently travelled on foot even as far as Newtown and St. Inigoes, in southern Maryland. In later times, when New York had no resident priest, it was occasionally visited from Philadelphia by Father Farmer. Fathers Greaton, Harding, Neale, and Lewis had also been in Philadelphia before the arrival of Molyneux in that city. But if Father Molyneux was not the first priest there who sowed the good seed for one of the most flourishing and noble churches on this continent, he helped, to a great extent, by his science and virtue to lay deep and wide and strong its glorious foundations.

Besides his other virtues, as pastor and superior, Father Molyneux showed a constant and unrelenting hatred of sin, an utter contempt for the things of this world, a great desire of religious perfection. Wealth, and rank, and pleasure, he cheerfully and willingly forsook for the love of his Divine Master. He followed closely in the glorious footprints of the companions of Ignatius of Loyola. From his own pen we have the picture of his ideal of a perfect pastor. We again copy from his sermon on Father Farmer: "The greater Glory of God appears to have been the origin, the aim, and the end to which, through every step of life, his mind and heart have been uniformly directed. Like the faithful husbandman, he has cultivated his Master's vineyard, and with zeal and diligence; he has dug it and pruned it in the scorching heat and pinching cold; he has watered it with his tears, and enriched it with the sweat of his brow; he has used all possible endeavors to clear it of the brambles and thorns which he discovered to encumber it; in fine, he has fenced it round with a double hedge of edifying examples and of sound, faithful precepts."

Another fact in the life of Father Molyneux must not be passed over in silence. He was the second Rector of Georgetown, the oldest Catholic College in the United States. Among the distinguished Rectors of this Institution we may name Bishops Louis G. Dubourg, Leonard Neale, and Benedict Fenwick; also Fathers Francis Neale, John A. Grassi, Anthony Kohlman, Stephen Dubuisson, William McSherry, and James Ryder. Fathers Ryder[1]

[1] Father James Ryder is still well remembered in Philadelphia as an eloquent pulpit-orator.

and Dubuisson were for some time stationed in Philadelphia, and were loved and esteemed for their virtue, zeal, and learning. While the latter was Pastor of St. Joseph's Church, in 1833, he attended to the Catholics of Trenton; that city is now honored with a Bishop. Father Molyneux was twice chosen Rector of Georgetown College; first, in July, 1793, and afterwards in October, 1806. During his Rectorship he strove effectually to elevate the course of studies and to promote among its students a love of virtue and science. Those who are familiar with the early history of the famous old college "situated on the northern bank of the Potomac, commanding a full view of Georgetown, Washington, and a great part of the District of Columbia," could, no doubt, give many interesting details relative to the great statesmen, foreign ambassadors and nobles and distinguished warriors of the Revolution who visited it during the Rectorship of Father Molyneux.

Father Molyneux during his lifetime made many distinguished friends in this country, in England, and on the Old Continent. But those who seemed to love and admire him most were those who, like himself, had consecrated their labors and their lives to the service of our Holy Church. The English Fathers whom he had known as missionaries in his native land, or as students in Belgium, always preserved for him a warm place in their hearts. In many of their letters we find them anxiously inquiring about his health or his labors. He was loved and esteemed to a greater extent still by all his brethren who devotedly labored in the missions in this country, whether their lot was cast on the borders of the Chesapeake, or in some of the more populous towns elsewhere. But the one who ever esteemed him most, the one who ever loved him most dearly, was the first Archbishop of Baltimore. There is something beautiful in the pure friendship that always existed through the varying events of life between him and the illustrious Prelate. These two great souls fully understood each other. The Archbishop, who had been trained in Jesuit schools, who had himself been a son of St. Ignatius up to the suppression of his Order, could fully appreciate the spirit that filled the lofty soul of his old professor. He could see in him a man who aimed continually to accomplish, in little as in great things, something for the glory of God and the advancement of His Earthly Kingdom. So highly did the great Archbishop esteem Father Molyneux that, over and over again, he tried to prevail upon him to become his Coadjutor Bishop. But from the dignity and the responsibility of the purple, the mitre, and the crosier, Father Molyneux always humbly fled.

After a life spent in the service of his neighbor, after a life devoted to the advancement of religion in these United States, after

a life of toils for Christ's love, Father Molyneux sank from his labors and his sufferings on the 19th of December, 1808, and went, we hope, to take possession of his crown, and throne, and sceptre, among God's angels and saints. Archbishop Carroll wrote, on the 21st of February, 1809, to Father Charles Plowden, Stonyhurst, near Clitheroe, announcing, in touching terms, the sad news of the demise of Father Molyneux. "About the beginning of December," writes the Archbishop, "I advised you of the apprehension I was then under, of daily hearing of the death of our old, good, and much-respected friend, Mr. Robert Molyneux, which event took place at Georgetown on the 9th of that month, after his being prepared by a life of candor and innocence, and by all those helps which are mercifully ordained for the comfort and advantage of departing Christians. Not only your charity, but your friendship for him, with whom you passed so many and cheerful and happy days of your life, will induce you to recommend very often his soul to the Father of mercies. He was my oldest friend, after my relation and companion to St. Omer's in my childhood, Mr. Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, remaining amongst us, as he often and feelingly reminded me the last time I saw him, in the month of September, with very slight hopes of meeting him more in this world."

In his "will," Father Molyneux says: "First, I give and bequeath my soul to Almighty God, in whose mercies I place my hopes, and my body to earth, to be decently interred." It is said, that his body, which was, indeed, "decently interred" amid the prayers of his religious brethren, and the tears and sobs of his many and dear friends among the laity, was the first laid in "the lowly valley of the dead at Georgetown."

A FEW WORDS MORE ON THE NEW BIBLE.

The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments, translated out of the Original Tongues; being the Version set forth A.D. 1611, compared with the most ancient authorities and revised. Printed for the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Oxford: at the University Press, 1885. Four volumes, 8vo.

MANY scholars some thirty years ago had no difficulty in predicting that a revision of King James' Bible would never take place, because such revision was morally impossible. It was taken for granted that none but the best scholars would undertake the work, and they must be supposed incapable of offering to put their hands to a no less futile than laborious task. The reasons alleged why such undertaking would be premature, rash, useless, and therefore not to be counted within the range of possibility, were manifold in detail; though they might be reduced to two general heads, viz., the acknowledged excellence of King James' translation, and the incompetency of actual scholarship to improve it.

Dr. Trench[1] (Dean of Westminster, and afterwards Archbishop of Dublin) decided that revision could not be thought of, because neither the Greek nor the English, necessary for such a work, could be found in the scholars of our day. Yet the time might come when a revision, though not needed, might be tolerated on purely philological grounds. Even thus, the work could only be entrusted to Anglican scholars and divines commendable for "their piety, their learning, and their prudence." Of course, no dignitary of the English Church could be expected to allow the Scriptural work of her royal Pontiff to be examined and reformed by those outside of her pale. And such claim, for all its apparent exclusiveness, cannot be accused of harshness or injustice. The Bible of 1611 had for its author the Supreme Ruler, and, as Anglicans profess to believe, the divinely appointed Head of their Church. There can be no doubt that he had the translation made as a doctrinal and disciplinary measure for the benefit of his spiritual subjects, and chiefly that it should serve as a prop for kingly and Episcopal power against the seditious spirit of Geneva and the Puritan divines. It may be true enough that the royal simpleton

[1] On the Authorized Version of the New Testament in connection with some recent Proposals for its Revision, by Richard Chenevix Trench, D.D., etc. New York: Redfield, 1858.

was egregiously befooled by his faithless translators. They tickled his ears by the most fulsome flattery, and thus blinded his eyes to their real purpose, which was to make of the translation a crafty compromise, a neutral book, in which revelation might lend its support alike to the pretensions of the hierarchical faction and to the levelling tendencies of their Presbyterian foes. But whether good or bad, a failure or a success, the book remains the property of its legitimate owner, the Anglican Church, and she alone has the right to subject it to official examination and modify it, if she will, by authoritative revision. Dr. Trench, however, showed great liberality in allowing that learned men of other denominations (with the exception of "the so-called Baptists") might be allowed to offer "suggestions" which the Anglican revisers would accept or reject as they judged best.

Mr. George P. Marsh,[1] writing about the same time, gives other reasons why no attempt at revision should be made just now. In the first place, English philology, or the critical study of English, is only in its infancy. Hence any revision attempted under present circumstances must be premature, and will have to be flung aside as worthless, should the day come when revision may be undertaken with some show of reason and prospect of success. Besides, he thinks, the knowledge of biblical Greek and Hebrew of which scholars will be in possession by the year 1899, will exceed that of the present day fully as much as the latter surpasses what was current in the beginning of the century. This argument, if fairly pushed, might be as conclusive for adjourning the revision to the year 1950 or 2000 as for beginning it in 1900. Mr. Marsh has another reason for putting off to a distant day all attempts to tamper with the received version. And this reason might have been profitably weighed by the revisers of 1881–84, had their object been to reproduce faithfully God's Word, instead of weakening it by insidious so-called scholarship. Mr. Marsh sees danger in the new systems of German criticism and theology, which have raised questions not of verbal interpretation merely, but of doctrine also, the discussion of which is no longer confined to Germany, but has spread to every part of the English-speaking world. And he deems it "highly improbable that a sufficient number of biblical scholars could be found even within the limits of any one Protestant denomination in either country (England or America) whose theological views so far harmonize that they would agree in new forms of expression upon points now under discussion." This, whether so intended or not, is far from a flattering compliment to Protestant unity and orthodoxy, when we reflect that such discus-

[1] Lectures on the English Language, by George P. Marsh. Third edition. New York: Charles Scribner, 1860. Lecture xxviii. The English Bible, p. 617-643.

sion covers points of vital interest to Revelation and the Christian religion.

Another critic, treating of the subject in the same year, thus summarily disposes of the Revision project. "The very completeness and sufficiency of the English version have, perhaps, prevented that painstaking and persevering study of the original languages of inspiration which marked the religious mind of the seventeenth century. It is certain that English-speaking Christendom cannot now present such a combination of profound scholarship and Christian charity on cardinal doctrines, as that which assisted the great work of the Bible revision in the days of King James"[1] If this were true, the Anglican version would be a marvel of perfection, and revision could not improve but only deface its fair lineaments. But we are quite sure that the writer did not intend his language to be taken *au pied de la lettre;* and that the esoteric sense of his words implies only rebuke of that idolatrous veneration in which the Bible of 1611 is held by too many of its admirers, and which, by resenting any attempt to investigate its boasted fidelity to the original, tends to raise up a perpetual barrier against all efforts of scholarship to improve or correct it by revision.

In spite of all the reasonings and forebodings of Trench, Marsh, and many others at home and abroad, the Revision has been undertaken and is now an accomplished fact; the New Testament having been given to the public in May, 1881, and the Old Testament four years after, in 1885. American divines of every religious hue were invited, not only to offer suggestions, but to examine and criticise the English work of revision, and, where they dissented on weighty matters, to have their opinions recorded in a special Appendix. Moreover, amongst the revisers sat not only Presbyterians, Methodists, and Lutherans, but even Quakers, Unitarians, and those dreadful Baptists, against whom Trench had raised his warning voice. The only condition imposed on the dissenting American revisers was, that for ten years they should abstain from issuing any edition of the Bible as their judgment would have it amended, and meanwhile "give the whole weight of their influence in favor of

[1] Russell's Magazine (October, 1858). Charleston: Walker, Evans & Co., vol. iv., 87. This magazine, though making no pretensions like its Northern contemporaries and their successors, numbered among its contributors such writers as William Gilmore Simms, Paul H. Hayne, and other able exponents of Southern literature. The article whence the extract given in the text is taken, is anonymous; but we think we could place our finger on the gifted writer. It was his delight in conversation, especially when amongst his hearers there were many of the "unco godlie," to take up some one of the idols of vulgar Protestantism (King James' Bible, for instance), and actually demolish it by extravagant praise, his edified hearers applauding him meanwhile as a fellow-worshipper. It was only the *élite* of his audience who could discern and enjoy the quiet irony and latent sarcasm with which he did his work. In the extract quoted, one reading between the lines may find traces of the same humor.

the English issues."[1] That they should not interfere with the privileges and profits of English publishers, was merely submission to a bargain, in which English shrewdness had the advantage. But to force upon them the positive promise that they would use their influence in aiding the circulation and perusal of a Bible which they believed to be incorrectly translated and incompletely revised, was something worse. It was cruel exaction on one side, and unworthy acquiescence on the other.

The American revisers were not ignorant of the importance and conscientious obligations of their assumed task, and knew well how to magnify their office when occasion called for it. One of themselves says: "To supplant a book which has been venerated by high and low for nearly three centuries, and has entered into the heart and life of the people as no other volume has ever done, is not a thing to be effected on short notice or by a sudden burst of enthusiasm. So grave a procedure requires the utmost caution that no source of information be neglected, that no error fail to be guarded against, and that in every case the best rendering be adopted. Things which in the translation of another book would be of small importance, here assume very great magnitude, because the matter in hand is the Word of God—that Word through which we are saved and by which we are to be judged."[2] Yet Rev. Mr. Chambers and his brethren have no scruple not merely to tolerate, but to give the aid of positive approval to a revision in which they know that the best readings were not adopted, but erroneous readings, which in the Word of God cannot be trifles, were carried against their protest by the votes of an English majority! It will scarcely be denied that by their conduct they have assumed, as Rev. Mr. Chambers would say, a "very great magnitude" of responsibility before God. Before man, their course does not appear very consistent with honesty and fair dealing. We hope that self-respect will in future restrain these men from harping on the "pious frauds"[3] of Bellarmin, Sixtus V., and Clement VIII., and "their clumsy, disingenuous efforts"[4] to hide the truth in the matter of the Sixtine and Clementine recensions.

The Revision is now before the public. It is by no means final, for there is no doubt it will have its successors. But, as far as it

---

[1] So says one of their number, Rev. Talbot W. Chambers (Dutch Reformed), in his "Companion to the Revised Old Testament." New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1885. P. 169.

[2] Chambers, "Companion to Revised Old Testament," pp. 49, 50.

[3] Canon Westcott, History of the Latin Vulgate, in Smith's "Biblical Dictionary," vol. iii.

[4] Rev Alexander Roberts, D.D. (Scotch Presbyterian, and another of the Revisers), "Old Testament Revision; a Handbook for English Readers." New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1883. P. 335.

goes, is it a success? The judgment of the multitude seems to have been unfavorable, for the new edition excited very little curiosity, and certainly no enthusiasm. But, leaving aside public opinion, which is founded too often on fashion or irrational motive, we may ask whether the Revision has been really—what its very name and alleged purpose would lead us to expect—an honest effort to improve the old version by ridding it of its blemishes and shortcomings, whether involuntary errors or deliberate sins of mistranslation? No impartial critic can fail to answer in the negative. Much has been done, and this deserves its share of praise. Especially in the New Testament, many, very many, and, it may be said, nearly all the wilful perversions of God's Word for sectarian purposes, have been duly corrected. Even in matters of mere narrative involving no doctrine, the false readings of the *Textus Receptus* have been properly discarded for those of older and purer texts, of which the Latin Vulgate is a faithful representative. Corrupt additions, too, which had crept from the margin into the text, and had been so firmly imbedded there as to be made into shibboleths of Protestantism, were ousted from their usurped place of honor, and declared to be, what they were, words of men, and not of God's inspiration. Such was the famous doxology in St. Matthew (Chapter vi.), for refusing to recite which as part of God's Word Catholic children have been scourged in our public schools. This is no figure of speech, but an actual fact, which took place in Boston, not long before the war, and which was chronicled in the daily papers at the time.[1] The young hero, who suffered stripes for the sake of God's pure Word, was, if not a truer Christian, certainly a better Biblical scholar than his teachers or the whole Boston School Board. May we hope that he still lives to enjoy whatever satisfaction can be derived from the testimony of the best Protestant scholars of England and America, proclaiming to the world that the Catholic child, taught by the traditions of his fathers, was right and King James' Bible wrong.

But, although the revised New Testament of King James was laudably purged of much of its sectarian dross,—we are using a

[1] We cannot pretend, at this late date, to recall the exact year in which this happened. It must have been between 1854 and 1859, when Know-Nothingism was rampant in many parts of the country, and especially in New England. The wicked spirit of this faction, which delighted not only in scourging our children, but in burning our churches and murdering Catholics in cold blood, out of hatred to their religion, would have had a much longer triumph, and might have succeeded in organizing a general persecution at the North, had not bigotry been forced to succumb before self-interest. It would have been poor policy to make enemies of Catholic soldiers when they were needed to fill the ranks of those who came down to invade, coerce, and desolate the unhappy South.

very mild phrase,—yet some of it remained. It was passed over, either inadvertently, because unnoticed, or retained upon deliberate reflection, out of that miserable spirit of compromise which could find no better way of showing its gratitude for permission to adopt some better reading from *Codices* Aleph, A or B in one place, than by allowing anti-Catholic corruptions to remain in others. In no other way can we explain some uncorrected passages; as, for example, the slur upon Catholic saints and the honor we owe them, never intended by St. Luke and St. James, but wickedly put into their mouths by heretical zeal, in Acts xiv., 15, and James v. 17. Saints Paul and Barnabas are made to say of themselves, and St. James of the prophet Elias, that they were "*men of like passions*," "*subject to like passions*," as ourselves and other men. Now, in the mouth of a Catholic, this might have a most orthodox sense; in the mouth of the Genevan Calvinist, who first used the expression, it could have no good meaning. It is the same hateful spirit in which, when we venerate the relics of saints and martyrs, they tell us, as did the Pagans of old, that we worship dead men's bones. In the same way, to dishonor God's friends whom we honor, they say and, if they could, would force Scripture to say: You are worshippers of mere men who are no better than yourselves, having the same passions as you have, whether Christians or heathen.[1]

Who would have imagined that so much venom could be got out of the innocent little word, ὁμοιοπαθής? To the Catholic, it furnishes matter for edification, to the Calvinist, a handle for reviling the Saints of God. One can scarcely help recalling the beautiful lines of Metastasio, describing the different way in which the bee and the serpent turn to account the same sweet flower. The Greek term most frequently is used as synonymous with ὁμοιότροπος, or its primitive, ὅμοιος, "like;" or, if we wish to retain the full etymological meaning, it may be rendered "liable to like infirmities," such as pain, sickness, death, etc. The word "*passions*," and all of wickedness that lurks behind it, came from the workshop of Geneva. Luther is innocent of this perversion, for he translates in James, "Elias war ein Mench *gleichwie* wir," and, in Acts, "wir sind auch *sterbliche* Menchen *gleichwie* ihr." It was Calvin who, in his translation and commentary, deliberately gave the keynote which was faithfully taken up by his disciples. The English exiles[2] of Geneva,

---

[1] Saints Paul and Barnabas were addressing Pagans, who were in the very act of committing idolatry (Acts xiv., 15).

[2] "We are, even, men, subject to like passions, that ye be" (Acts xiv., 15). "Helias a man, subject to like passions, as we be" (James v., 17).

the Spanish,[1] Italian[2] and French[3] translators, all believed it right and proper to force into the text of the New Testament this novel teaching of their newly-adopted pontiff and lawgiver. It may be said that the word *passions* can be understood in a philosophical sense (τα πάθη or παθήματα). It might by a philosopher or learned student; it is not so understood by the common reader. Nor was it the intention of those artful depravers of God's Word. They wished to disparage in the mind of the reader the great heroes whom the Catholic Church holds in such high esteem and veneration, and to flatter him with the thought that Elias, Barnabas, Paul and other great saints are no better than himself. Calvin does not attempt to conceal what was meant by his novel translation, which, in his Latin Commentary, reads as follows: "Elias homo erat passionibus similiter obnoxius ut nos,"[4]—"Elias was a man, subject to passions in like manner as we are." Having thus introduced his gloss into the text under cover of translation, he further explains himself, substantially, as follows: James is here replying to the Catholic objection, that we are far from the degree of holiness possessed by Elias, and, therefore, cannot hope as much from our unworthy prayers. Hence, he lowers Elias to our standard and reminds us that he was a man subject to the same passions as ourselves. It is a mere fiction of the imagination to look upon the Saints as so many demigods or heroes, who enjoyed special intercourse with the Divinity. It is not only imagination, but profane

[1] "Elias era hombre sujecto a semejentes passiones que nosotros" (James v., 17). In the Acts, he translates more rationally: "Mortales hombres semejentes a vosotros."

[2] Diodati, in the Acts, has "ancora noi siamo uomini sottoposti a medesime passioni come voi," and, in St. James, "Elia era uomo sottoposto a medesime, passioni come noi." The former Italian translator of Geneva has the passage of Acts rendered in the very same words as Diodati, with the exception of *che* for *come*. In St. James, he reads "Elia era uomo sottoposto a simili passioni che noi," which is not much of an improvement.

[3] The Genevan French of Hutter's Polyglot has had the good sense and decency to substitute a milder term for "passions." "Nous sommes aussi hommes sujets a mesmes affections que vous" (Acts, *l. c.*), and "Elie estoit homme sujet a semblables affections que nous" (St. James, *l. c.*). Ostervald has done better, in Acts: "des hommes sujets aux mêmes infirmités que vous," and, in St. James, "Elie etoit un homme sujet aux mêmes affections que vous." It is said that Ostervald's Bible has been lately revised and corrected, of which the New Testament (by M. Frossard), approved by a conference of French ministers, was published in 1869, and the Old Testament (revised by a committee of thirteen), in 1879. It is said, further, that this edition only will be circulated in future by the British and American Bible Societies. We hope Ostervald's doctrinal errors, derived from Calvin, Olivetan, and Beza, have been corrected. But, when we consider the liberal tendencies of modern French Protestantism, we fear that they have regarded these sectarian blemishes as too despicable to deserve attention, and that their whole study has been to purify critically the Textus Receptus of the New Testament, and to rationalize the Old, according to the latest requirements of "scientific" theology.

[4] Io. Calvini in Novum Testamentum Commentarii. Edidit et præfatus est A. Tholuck, Berolini. 1834. Vol. vii., p. 384.

and Pagan superstition. And to drive it out of our minds, James would have us consider the Saints in the weakness of their flesh, that we may learn that it was not their merits but their prayers that obtained them a hearing. Hence, it is clearly seen what childish triflers are the Papists, who teach men to have recourse to the help of the Saints. We add Calvin's own words in the original Latin:

"Ne quis autem objiceret, longe nos distare a gradu Eliæ, eum collocat in nostro ordine, quum dicit hominem fuisse mortalem et iisdem nobiscum passionibus obnoxium. Nam ideo minus proficimus in sanctorum exemplis, quia ipsos fingimus semideos vel heroas, quibus peculiare fuerit cum Deo commercium; ita ex eo quod exauditi sunt, nihil fiduciæ concipimus. Ut hanc ethnicam et profanam superstitionem Jacobus excutiat, sanctos in carnis infirmitate considerandos esse admonet, ut discamus non eorum meritis, sed orationis efficaciæ tribuere, quod omnia a Deo impetrarunt. Hinc apparet quam pueriliter nugentur papistæ, qui ad sanctorum patrocinium confugere docent, quia exauditi fuerint a Domino," etc.—(*l. cit.*, p. 386).

This attempt of Calvin to read the mind and make out the purpose of St. James, by supposing him a fervent Protestant, replying in advance to possible Catholic objections, is not very complimentary to Luther, whose keen eye detected in the holy apostle a preacher of works, a teacher of papistical doctrine, and therefore contemptuously cast him out of the Canon. Hence, whoever would pin his faith to the authority of these two great founders of a purer Christianity will, owing to their disagreement, never be in a position to decide whether St. James was a Catholic or a Protestant. As far as it is a mere question of two erroneous conjectures, we should give the palm to Luther's wild guesswork, abstracting from its impiety. It takes no little boldness to affirm that Catholics are guilty of "profane, Pagan superstition," when they believe that it was given to God's saints to hold special intercourse with Him. In so believing, they but adhere to the strict historical truth of the Bible, which Calvin must either have never read, or found it convenient to forget. In its pages we are told how Abraham, Moses, the very Elias of whom St. James speaks, and others used to enjoy familiar converse with the Most High, He speaking to them "face to face, as a man is wont to speak to a friend."[1]

[1] "Facie ad faciem, sicut solet loqui homo ad amicum suum" (Exod. xxxiii., 11). The familiarity to which the Lord deigned to admit Abraham is so well known from Genesis, and so wonderful, that, in the hymns and prayers of the Syriac Liturgy, his name is scarcely ever mentioned without the adjunct "Rohhmeh d'Alloho,"—"The Friend of God." And God is still besought for mercy through his intercession, as frequently as through that of any other Saint, except His own Virgin Mother.

Calvin (to whose school may be traced most of the errors of King James' Bible) fell into the fatal mistake, so common to other Protestant interpreters of his day, of making his translation answer the purpose of a commentary, in other words, of adding, amplifying and so enforcing through the text what he conceived to be the too concisely or insufficiently expressed meaning of the sacred writer. Even where the added matter is true, few will venture to maintain that such a course can be reconciled with honesty or with due reverence for God's spoken or written Word. But what shall we say of him who professes and even boasts his own fallibility, and yet thrusts his private opinion into the sacred text, and as far as he can palms it off on the world as an oracle of God? And what must the Catholic feel who knows, with all the certainty of divine faith, that such opinion is neither probable nor even possible, but in direct contradiction with the doctrine taught by Him who is Truth itself, to His apostles and disciples? He can only shudder with horror at what he must hold to be downright sacrilege and blasphemy. The ancient Christians, even heretics with few exceptions, were singularly free from this wicked device. Both good and bad felt truly and deeply in their hearts—what is too often only on the lips of modern Bibliolatry—an unbounded reverence for the Word of God, which would not allow them to use it for unlawful purposes.

Catholics in the West might translate from the Greek for their own devotion, but they would never think of wilfully altering the text. If heretics attempted to translate for sectarian ends, they had to reckon with such formidable witnesses against them as the Itala, and subsequently the Vulgate, which had already preoccupied the ground—to say nothing of the Greek original, which was sufficiently within the reach of all persons of tolerable education. Luckily for them, there existed no temptation of translating the Scriptures for the first time into a vernacular tongue which was just emerging from barbaric forms into the light of literary polish and culture, or into which the Scriptures had not yet been translated. The Syriac version of the Pshitto, indeed, was made into a language which had never before known a translation of the Old or New Testament, and dates nearly from the time of the Apostles. But it was made by God-fearing Christian men, who had no systems of their own to build up, no private opinions for which God's Word in the vernacular might be cunningly made a vehicle, but simply the intention of faithfully spreading before their countrymen the divine oracles. Hence, we find that in the two passages under consideration, they translate simply and truthfully, as does the Vulgate, "passible (liable to infirmity or suffering) like you," and

"passible like us."[1] It was reserved for the wisdom of later days to manipulate the revealed Word so skilfully that readers of the vernacular, instead of wading through commentaries, should be enabled to find in the text itself, more or less plainly, justification by faith alone, the idolatry of honoring the Saints and reverencing their relics and pictures, the absurdity of confession, fasting, and mortification; in a word, all the salient points of doctrine in which the new Gospel differed from the Church of sixteen centuries.

They could now well afford to clothe with some poor semblance of truth their boasted promise of giving the world (what Rome did not) a free, pure Bible, without note or comment, since they had secured, in the artfully prepared text, a stealthy commentary which, while avoiding that odious name, was sufficient to warp the judgment of ignorant or incautious readers. The promise, hitherto, had been an empty boast, false in fact, and insincere in the mouths of those who uttered it. History tells us how they acted from the very beginning of the "Reformation." They clamored without ceasing that Scripture was all-sufficient, that it was the only guide of doctrine and life, and which abundantly explained itself, without need of an interpreter. But, how little they believed of all this, is clear from the way in which they filled their vernacular Bibles with notes, which taught the reader what to find in the text, and what to infer from it. We all know what use Luther made of his Randglossen (marginal notes) to prop up his mistranslations, and what zealous imitators of his example were the English Calvinists. It is needless to say that these notes contained much false doctrine and perverse interpretations of Scripture. Still worse, they teemed with the fiercest expressions of anti-Catholic hate and bitterness: they breathed sedition, and piously suggested murder. The worst of them came from the pen of the fanatical Scotch and English exiles, who had found an asylum in Geneva. When, from well-grounded fear of these annotations, the prelatical party succeeded in persuading King James to issue a new version, without note or comment, it was only with reluctance that the Puritan divines consented. They were yet as "fond of annotations" as their predecessors of the sixteenth century, and wished "to follow the Geneva fashion."[2] When, subsequently (under the Commonwealth),

---

[1] In Acts xiv., 15, "*Hhoshushe acwotcun;* in James v., 17, "*Hhoshusho acwotan.*" Rev. Dr. Murdock, a Presbyterian minister of New England, whose chief aim seems to show how he can improve his text by high-flown translation, renders the passage of St. James, "Elias was a man of sensations like us"; while, in Acts, he makes the Apostles tell the Pagan crowd, with all the elegant ease of the modern pulpit, "We are, also, frail mortals like yourselves."—New Testament; translated from the Syriac by James Murdock, D.D. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1879. Pp. 243, 419.

[2] See "Our English Bible," by John Stoughton, D.D. London: Relig. Tract Society. No date, but probably 1879 or 1880. P. 270.

they had their own way, they tried to displace the "prelatical Bible" of King James by a new translation, which, doubtless, would have been filled with notes of the Geneva pattern. The Cromwellian tyranny was too short to give time for the new translation; but they made the most of their early success (1644) by giving out an authorized edition of Puritan note and comment. It is futile to remark that this book, the "Assembly's Annotations," did not receive the formal sanction of the Presbyterian divines of Westminster. It was gotten up by their creatures in the Parliament, and sanctioned by that Assembly, which had taken the King's place in the Headship of the Church. The Episcopal faction was wiser in its reckoning. It believed that the Bible had been so well Protestantized by mistranslation, that it could be safely trusted to the unaided intelligence of the English reader. And, after a while, the Nonconformist or Puritan element of the English Church learned to take the same view, aud renounce its love for an annotated Bible. And, at the present day, both factions alike agree in obtruding upon us, in season and out of season, as if we knew nothing of their past history, volumes of pious, pretentious talk (*gush*, the vulgar call it) about their love of "a pure Bible, without note or comment."

The revisers, in both places, have retained the old translation, though they give evidence of knowing better, by appending to the word "passions" the marginal note "*or nature*." This recourse to the margin is no real remedy for a mistranslation. It may impose on a few innocent scholars, who will think they see in it a candid confession of needed correction. Perhaps it is intended for this very purpose. But, for one scholar who reads the Bible, there are thousands and tens of thousands of ignorant readers who never will have a chance of seeing these marginal notes. They are never printed in the Bibles intended for general circulation. To say that one in ten thousand gives them, would be an exaggeration. Hence the only real advantage, for which the cause of truth is indebted to the revisers, is where they have cured mistranslation by altering King James' text. But there is another ill-use that can be made of the margin, and it is to be feared that the revisers have deliberately had recourse to it. There is scarcely a prophecy concerning our Saviour in the Old Testament that is not subject to peculiar difficulties, arising from various readings, and from the fact that the Jewish Masoreths have invariably preferred the reading less favorable to Christian argument. Sometimes the reading is so absurd that common sense may reject it at once, without any need of reference to the LXX, and Vulgate, or other ancient version. Now, as a rule, the revisers use the margin to commend the reading that is least favorable to Christian faith. They have had the hardihood,

to use no stronger term, to reproduce, in the margin of Psalms xxii., 17, the atrocious *Caari* (like a lion) of the corrupt Jewish text, instead of what all antiquity had found there, *Caru* or *Caaru* (they have "dug" or pierced).[1] The common people may not have a chance to see this variant in the margin; but that does not lessen the impiety of putting it there. Infidels and Rationalists will admire the bold step; and, with the growth of Liberal Christianity, so-called, the day may come when it will be transferred from the margin to the text.[2] Indeed, the principle laid down by the revisers, and vigorously pushed to its utmost extent by the American divines, of sticking throughout to the Masoretic recension, in spite of any old version, would justify such transfer even now.

The liberalistic tendency of the revisers appears from other considerations, and chiefly from what they neglected to do. They carried out pretty well their main purpose, which was to rid King James' Bible of those glaring faults of mistranslation which scandalized all Hebrew scholars, from a purely philological point of view. But it was no part of their purpose to correct doctrinal errors, or do away with the sectarian bias given to the text by their predecessors. The adroit handling of the Revealed Word, so as to make of it a vehicle for error, is a wicked science in which heresy has always excelled. But from Marcion down to our day, none have carried it to such perfection as Luther and Beza and the Calvinists who founded the English Church, whatever may have been their designation, High or Low, Anglican or Presbyterian. The lordly prelate on his episcopal throne was as skilled and unscrupulous in this black art, as the ranting gospeller or exiled nonconformist in Geneva or the Low Countries. But the experience of Luther and Beza, and the outcry raised by their forcible violation of the text, had not been lost upon these quickwitted disciples. They learned that to deface the text wantonly by adding to or taking away from it, is not always needed, and is beset by so many risks that it must be resorted to only in cases of extreme necessity. It is much better strategy to hide or efface the meaning intended by the sacred writer and required by the context or derived from perpetual tradition, by picking out meanings that would be simply possible in another context, or by selecting for the translation terms that will disguise or weaken the force of the

[1] This is, probably, the only wilful perversion in the entire Hebrew Bible. The Vulgate has "Foderunt manus meas et pedes meos,"—"They have dug my hands and my feet." Ps. xxi. (Hebr. xxii.), 17.

[2] Something similar came near happening under Puritan rule in England. In the days of the Commonwealth, when changes in the Bible were discussed, the Commission was charged with the inquiry, whether it might not be well to transfer some readings from the margin to the text, in the interests of Puritan orthodoxy, no doubt. See Stoughton, "Our English Bible," *l. c.*

passage, or by using any other artifice that will insinuate false doctrine or exclude at least the Catholic sense. It was in this spirit that the version of King James was conceived and executed; and many of its worst points are retained by the revisers, not because they were counted to be of any value, but rather because they were looked on with contempt as theological rubbish by our high-minded Rationalistic correctors.

It may be well to illustrate this by an example or two. In Daniel iv., 24 (*al.* 27) the holy prophet urges the proud Heathen monarch to make amends for his past sins by almsgiving. So says the original Chaldee,[1] and so say with one accord the ancient versions. The Latin Vulgate has "Peccata tua eleemosynis redime et iniquitates tuas misericordiis pauperum." "Redeem thy sins by alms-deeds and thy iniquities by works of mercy to the poor." This wore an ugly look for men who had made up their minds that good works were only "filthy rags," useless and even hurtful to salvation, according to the new gospel. Accordingly, it was altered as follows: "Break off thy sins by righteousnesss and thy iniquities by showing mercy to the poor." But there could be no doubt that the passage taught what Daniel and the people of God in his day believed (Tobias xii., 8), and what the New Testament and the unchanging tradition of the Church has ever held. Works of charity and mercy, especially to the poor, are wholesome for the just and for sinners. In the former it causes grace to abound still more; it helps the latter to obtain mercy and forgiveness. This is the doctrine repeated on the pages of our Lord's Gospel and in the preaching of His inspired Apostles. It is the merciful who are to obtain mercy; he who forgives shall be forgiven; he who feeds the needy shall be recompensed at the resurrection of the just; he who ministers to the poor has Christ himself for the recipient of his bounty; even a cup of cold water will not fail of its reward. We are all God's debtors, and our indebtedness is cancelled by forgiving our neighbor's debts and trespasses in our own regard. We have dealt wrongly by our Lord and Master; we redeem our injustice by giving freely to Christ in the person of His poor. For He counts as done to Himself whatever we do to the least of His brethren. Whoever has not learnt this from the New Testament, has read it to very little advantage. To any one, therefore, who is satisfied with the plain teaching of Christ and His apostles in the New Law, there can be no difficulty, nothing strange or unexpected in this passage of Daniel. But heresy cannot tolerate Catholic language in Daniel or Moses any more than in the Apostles St. Paul or St. James.

Did St. Jerome render the words of the prophet correctly? Un-

[1] This portion of Daniel is in Aramaic, generally known as "Biblical Chaldee."

questionably; and all the ancient versions—Greek, Syriac and Arabic—bear testimony to his accuracy. So, too, do the learned Rabbins Iacchiades (R. Joseph Iachya), Aben Ezra and Saadias, who represent not only the Jewish *consensus* of their day (the fifteenth, twelfth and tenth centuries, respectively), but also the traditions of their earliest fathers. Candid Protestants, who spurn party dictation, like Grotius and Louis de Dieu, find no fault with St. Jerome's version. Impartial lexicographers, like Gesenius, who do not allow their learning to be clouded by sectarian prejudice, lay it down as certain that, in the text, *phruk* (imperative of *phrak*) means *redeem*, and *Ssidka*, *almsgiving*. The very parallelism or consonance of the two members,

> "Redeem thy sins by almsgiving,
> And thy iniquities by mercy to the poor,"

strongly confirms the soundness of the old renderings. Why, then, did all the "Reformers," from Luther to King James, translate wrongly? An honest Protestant confesses the reason. He says, that all translators render "break off by righteousness" or "redeem by almsdeeds," just in proportion as they believe good works to be useless or conducive to salvation; in other words, as they hold the Protestant or Catholic view of the meritoriousness of works. Now, we will take his word against his brethren, whom he accuses of translating according to their prejudices. For, all the versions with which we find fault were made after the "Reformatian," and to bolster up its doctrines. But we cannot understand how his word can apply against Catholic translations, for they were made long ago, one of them (the *LXX*), nearly two thousand years before the Protestant doctrine of faith and works was known or thought of in the world.

But, why did the revisers retain the error of King James in Daniel? For the same reason that they retained the mistranslations of Genesis iv., 7 and Genesis xiv., 18, which were intended to shut out from the text the Catholic doctrine that concupiscence and sin have no absolute mastery over free-will, and that there is a connection of lofty import (almost surpassing any attempt at interpretation, as St. Paul intimates, Hebrews v., 11) between Melchisedech's priesthood and his sacrifice of bread and wine. It is not anti-Catholic feeling, we feel sure, that prompted their action, or rather their unwillingness to act, but downright contempt of these petty sectarian matters. They either hold that the Bible teaches nothing concerning these points, or, if it does, that we are not to be fettered by the private notions of Matthew, James, Peter and John, which may be allowed or dismissed, as his better judgment will direct, by the enlightened theologian of to-day. Protestantism has at its back church revenues and social advantages which

deserve respect; but its positive teaching, having accomplished its work of humbling Roman supremacy, is no longer needed. In fact, its orthodox views, wherever they survive, are as bigoted as Rome's, and stand in the way of those who would like to handle the miracles, prophecies and other mythical portions of the Old Testament, that we should like to submit to scientific exegesis, as freely as is done on the Continent of Europe. But the orthodoxy or bigotry, by which we are surrounded, compels us to wear a mask until the happy day comes when speech will be as free for us as thought.

The next revision of the English Bible will be issued on this side of the Atlantic, and will contain the improvements of the American side of the Commission, many of them very sensible, many more distinguished even now by a bold neology, which will have become akin to open impiety by the time the expiration of the English bargain will leave the press free for an American Revised Bible, which will undermine still further all respect for divine inspiration. In an enterprise like this, all is progress towards the abyss; its practical motto, *Vestigia nulla retrorsum.* So it will be everywhere. Luther's German Bible, in a revised form, is now on trial before the people of Germany. It was thought that his bold language and dogmatical corruptions would be carefully corrected. All have been disappointed, Catholic and Protestant. The main point of the revisers seems to have been to break down the force of all the Messianic prophecies in the Old Testament. And this is the result of great expectations, magnificent promises, and years of weary waiting.

Scientific Chronicle.

SCIENTIFIC EDUCATION.

One of the many signs of scientific progress in our day is the lively interest taken in scientific education. Love for the sciences is no longer confined to the few, but has now become widespread and ever increasing; efforts are everywhere being made to render scientific education more practical and more general. Europe and America are making great strides to this end, and indeed seem to respond eagerly to the call which Sir Lyon Playfair made upon England last Summer, in his opening address at Aberdeen, before the British Association. It was his claim "that the relation of science to the State should be more intimate, because the advance of science is needful to public weal;" and his words had all the more weight in that he spoke not only as a man of science, but also as a statesman. Further on in the same address he used these words: "In the United Kingdom we are just beginning to understand the wisdom of Washington's farewell address to his countrymen when he said, 'Promote, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge.'" Here, restricting this last word to physical and natural sciences, Sir Lyon Playfair passes on to the consideration of scientific growth in various countries. He dwells at some length on the energetic efforts made in France and Germany, and notices with pleasure the pecuniary assistance they have lent. Of our own country he said: "More remarkable is it to see a young nation, like the United States, reserving 150,000,000 acres of national land for the promotion of scientific education. In some respects this young country is in advance of all European nations in joining science to its administrative offices." In confirmation of this last assertion he cites the work of the Fish Commission and the Geological Survey.

But his great point in this discourse was to emphasize the urgent necessity of scientific education. From the example of Continental Europe and our own country he goes on to show that the great English Universities—far advanced though they be—have not the support and encouragement of which they are certainly deserving. As instances of the liberality of other countries, he mentions the Universities of Strasburg and Leipsic, each of which receives from the State £10,000 more than the Universities of either Ireland or Scotland. Words such as these should make us thoughtful and fill us with new life in a noble cause. Gratifying though it is to see that our work is held in esteem abroad, and that our efforts as a nation to promote scientific knowledge are looked upon with pleasure and highly appreciated, still we should bear in mind that there is yet much to be done. True, on account of peculiar circumstances, our Universities are not supported by the

National Government, nor is it desirable that they should be; still they are prospering and making progress, especially in the physical and natural sciences. And this is seen not only at Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and Pennsylvania Universities, but also in the younger institutions, as the Johns Hopkins and others. One and all show a common energy and vitality, and there is every prospect of a glorious future, especially if what we have lately heard be true, that California is to have a new University with a foundation of $20,000,000, the gift of Senator Stanford. Everywhere new and costly buildings spring up for scientific purposes; everywhere new museums, new libraries and laboratories for physics, chemistry, and biology, numerous and well-equipped observatories are scattered over the land, and not a few of them have gained a world-wide reputation. The National Observatory and the Lick Observatory at Mt. Hamilton, Cal., are, or soon will be, provided with powerful telescopes, and their work, like that of our Cambridge Observatory, is second to none.

What we say of scientific progress in our Universities, holds good likewise for our colleges and schools; for they, too, have given the sciences a place in the regular course. Indeed, it must be granted that in many cases the enthusiasm in this direction has led to excess either in the method or in the matter, an excess that has been oftentimes fraught with regretful results; but for the most part the change is being brought about skilfully and quietly, and each day tells the story that the good work is fast gaining ground. All that wealth and untiring efforts can do is being done to promote scientific education, and give it a place along with the more purely literary studies of our schools.

Our Catholic institutions, as the Report of the Smithsonian shows, —and since that Report the advance is still more marked,—follow the general movement; and though the efforts in this respect are not yet as energetic as many lovers of science would have them, still there is a progress, and we have every reason to cherish bright hopes of the future. It is greatly to be desired that Institutions may soon rise up among us that will rank among the highest and be illustrious for the excellence of their scientific course. It must, beyond doubt, be evident to all how important it is that we should hold a prominent place in this line; for as the learned Benedictine, Cardinal Pitra, justly remarked about a year ago, "It is good that the clergy, who have in their theology the key to all the sciences, should neglect none of them, and we ought also to have our specialists. . . . . it is important that, with a rich store of the science of the Sanctuary, the clergy should not be strangers to that other knowledge of which the world is proud. . . . . There is in these studies, which are dry at first sight, pure and healthy delight, which grows towards enthusiasm in the measure in which one cultivates with perseverance the at first thorny field. It is well that the clergy should consecrate their leisure and spare energies to these labors."

ASTRONOMY.

New Star in Andromeda.

The phenomena of "Nova Andromedæ" that for the past few months have so much engaged the attention of astronomers, seem at length capable of a satisfactory explanation. The nebula in Andromeda is one of the largest and most conspicuous in the heavens. On favorable nights it is visible to the naked eye and has the "appearance of a faint oval patch of silvery light." Viewed through a small telescope, it answers the description that Marius gave of it in 1614, namely: It resembles a light seen through a piece of horn. In the opinion of some astronomical authorities, the nebula of Andromeda has a tendency to be resolved into stars, but though several hundreds of stars have been detected within its limits, it cannot be distinctly resolved even by such telescopes as Lord Rosse's, the one at Pulkowa, or that at Washington. It is, therefore, classed among the unresolved nebulæ. Still the spectroscope seems to indicate what was suspected from telescopic appearances, namely, that this nebula is in an intermediate state between nebulæ proper and star clusters. For, unlike most of the nebulæ, its spectrum is not a bright-band spectrum, but rather a continuous one, resembling that of a gas at high pressure. Hence we are led to believe that the nebula in question is in an intermediate state, and that, according to Laplace's hypothesis, it is a nebular mass slowly condensing into stars.

Towards the end of August, as is well known, a new star became visible near the nucleus of the nebula. The star's appearance was very sudden; for the nebula was closely examined at Brussels, at the beginning of August, without anything being perceived, while a few days later several observers found that its central portion was growing brighter. This unexpected phenomenon at once attracted the closest attention, and everywhere both spectroscope and telescope were directed to its investigation. The suddenness of the change could not at all be reconciled with the gradual formation of centres, in accordance with the Laplace theory, which, notwithstanding several difficulties accompanying it, is generally admitted by astronomers.

All were, therefore, anxious to know whether such a transformation was, in truth, taking place. At first, it was with difficulty that the star could be distinguished from the nucleus of the nebula, but when its brightness reached that of a star of the seventh magnitude it was seen to be distinct from it. It is now growing less bright, at the rate of one magnitude every three weeks, its lustre being at present (early in December) equal to that of a star of the eleventh magnitude.

In the beginning, the spectroscope indicated that the star belonged to the nebula, because its spectrum and that of the nebula appeared to be identical. But a closer examination, made by Dr. Higgins, of London, and confirmed at other observatories, as at Stonyhurst, seems to show that a bright-band spectrum was overlying a continuous spectrum between the lines D and d, and this appearance leads to the opinion

that "Nova Andromedæ" is a star only optically connected with the nebula, that is, a temporary star—possibly a periodic one—which lies in the direction of the nebula, but altogether independent of it.

PHYSICS AND CHEMISTRY.

Electrical Furnaces and the Aluminium Compounds.

The introduction of electrical furnaces seems to point to a radical change in the metallurgy of many useful metals. The experiments already made, though on a comparatively small scale, have worked a great change in the production of aluminium compounds.

Until lately, the usefulness of electricity in metallurgy, because confined to the decomposition of solutions of metallic salts, was necessarily limited. Siemens, Depretz, and a few others, advanced a step further towards the accomplishment of what now seems within reach. These scientists endeavored to utilize in the reduction or melting of metals the intense heat of the electric arc. But their success was not very marked, at least from a commercial point of view. A short time ago, however, Messrs. Cowles, of Cleveland, now of the "Cowles' Electric Smelting and Aluminium Company," obtained results which surpass anything thought of before in that line. Their method, adopted after many and rigorous tests, is substantially the following. The ore to be reduced is placed, together with broken carbon, in a fire-clay retort. Then, a powerful current generated by a dynamo is allowed to pass through it. The great resistance offered by the mixture raises the temperature to such a degree that the ore is reduced. As the amount of resistance offered by the carbon may vary in the course of the operation, great care must be taken not to injure the generator. This may be readily effected by shunting the current, and inserting a duly regulated resistance-coil. Besides, to insure greater safety, an Ammeter is so arranged as to measure the intensity of the current at any moment. The current, as it passes through the retort thus provided, produces, as we have said, an extremely high temperature. By thus transforming great electrical energy into heat, and confining it within a small space, we may raise the temperature almost indefinitely. For the height to which it can be raised depends solely on the force of the dynamos and the degree of infusibility possessed by the substance used in making the furnace.

An incalculable amount of motive power might be given to the dynamos from waterfalls. Hence, we are not surprised at finding that the above-mentioned Company contemplate vast projects in this direction.

In some of the first experiments, the heat became so intense that the interior of the furnace itself was fused. This inconvenience has been remedied by surrounding with more of the mixture of carbon and the ore to be reduced the space between the electrodes, where the greatest heat is had. Thus all the heat is brought to bear on the mixture, and not on the furnace.

By means of this process lumps of lime and some corundum have been melted. The molten masses crystallized on cooling into long and well-

defined crystals. Many oxides, that have hitherto been considered almost incapable of decomposition, have been successfully acted upon; thus, among others, the oxides of aluminium, silicon, boron, manganese, magnesium, sodium, and potassium have been already decomposed.

To show the practical and commercial utility of this very ingenious invention, we might mention many valuable compounds already obtained; such, for example, as the boron and silicon bronzes, this latter being, of all known substances, the best adapted for telegraph and telephone wires. But we limit ourselves for the present to the aluminium alloys. Pure aluminium is, perhaps, one of the most useful metals, because of its lightness, tenacity, and beautiful color. It is, moreover, of common occurrence, being the base of all clays. It has not, as yet, been obtained by the electrical method. The reason is, that pure aluminium and carbon unite somewhat readily; as soon, then, as the pure aluminium finds itself in the furnace alone with the carbon which was placed in it as a resisting and reducing medium, it at once combines with it, yielding a compound similar to pig-iron. This substance, hitherto not well studied, promises to prove very serviceable. The aluminium alloys have, in proportion, the same useful qualities that aluminium itself possesses. Of late, aluminium-silver and aluminium-bronze, obtained by the process of the French chemist Deville, could be purchased at fifteen dollars per pound. Now, thanks to the ingenious contriver of the electrical furnace, this same silver and bronze costs only five dollars per pound. This reduction will, no doubt, further increase; but even at present cost these alloys, because of their lightness and strength, are almost invaluable for many purposes. Thus, the 10 per cent. aluminium-bronze (10 per cent. aluminium and 90 per cent. copper) whose color is that of gold, besides being capable of holding out against a tensile strain of 109,000 pounds to the square inch, is so hard and durable as to stand more wear and tear than any metal now in use. The 5 per cent. bronze, though not quite so strong, hardly tarnishes in the air, while the 2 per cent. and 3 per cent. bronzes are stronger than brass. The Hercules metal, an alloy of copper, nickel, and aluminium, stands a strain of more than 111,000 pounds to the square inch. A little aluminium added to brass doubles its strength. We might here mention other compounds, but the results arrived at by recent study are not yet fully known.

Decomposition of Didymium.

This discovery, by no means of so great practical importance as the preceding, is from a theoretical point of view of very great moment. The "Chemiker Zeitung" gives an account of a memoir, presented by Dr. C. A. von Welsbach to the Vienna Academy of Science, in which he announces that didymium, one of the rare metals, results from the union of two substances, whose properties are altogether different. Nor was this decomposition wholly unexpected. In fact, the broadly-fluted absorption bands produced by the chloride of this metal are similar to those of blood, or of magenta, and recall to mind the wide, bright lines in the spectrum of the calcium salts and the carbon compounds.

This is not the first time that so-called chemical elements have been decomposed. At the beginning of the present century Davy split up the hydrates of sodium and potassium, till then considered as elements.

But the interest attaching to the decomposition of didymium is particularly great, because it recalls to mind the speculation advanced about seven years ago, according to which the bodies that we call chemical elements are all made up of a few elementary substances,—and even, perhaps, of a single one in different allotropic states. This opinion, as is quite evident, is of vast import not only to the chemist, whose science, did it prove true, would have to be reorganized, but also to metaphysicians, who at the present day make so much of anything that bears on the composition of bodies. It was Lockyer who, comparing the spectra of different metals in order to ascertain the presence of their absorption lines in the sun-spectrum, first formulated this theory. It has not, however, so far as we know, been yet embraced by any chemist of note. Still the plausible reasons on which it is based have not yet been positively disproved.

Examining the spectra of several metals at different temperatures, Lockyer found that they often vary, as do the iron spectra, when seen at a very high temperature in the solar chromosphere and in the protuberances, or when seen at a much lower temperature in the solar spots. Hence he was led to consider the iron spectrum of our laboratories as formed by the superposition of two distinct spectra, the iron vapors having different temperatures in different parts of the electric spark. Then by a series of experiments and a course of reasoning, too long to be here set forth, he reached the conclusion that iron, with many other metals, and, perhaps, with all the other "elements," is probably composed of more elementary substances; which, though separated by dissociation at high temperatures—as happens in the solar protuberances,—remain united at lower temperatures, as may be seen in the solar spots. The discovery recently made with regard to didymium evidently lends some support to this view. Its spectrum, already studied by Gladstone, Thalèn and others, has been found so similar to that of iron that the two metals, though otherwise very different, are classified together. This circumstance seems to give additional probability to the opinion that iron, and perhaps all other allied metals, are also compounds. The fact, too, that didymium has been decomposed, not by dissociation at a high temperature, but by ordinary chemical means, opens a new field of inquiry that may in the end determine whether the so-called chemical elements are really simple or not.

Composite Photography.

In August, 1877, Mr. Francis Galton, F.R.S., laid before the scientific societies of England an account of a new form of light-writing, which he termed Composite Photography. Four years later he published a paper on the same subject, having in the meantime modified and improved his process. This process has attracted great attention

of late in scientific circles, especially on account of the attempts of others to repeat it.

It may prove interesting to our readers to follow Mr. Galton, as he sets himself to study "the varied hereditary faculties of different men and to note the great difference in different families and races." But here one may ask, how shall we get at these characteristics of a race? Evidently by examining individuals. As from the dwelling we may form a pretty just estimate of the social standing its inmates enjoy, so from a glance at the soul's dwelling we may get an idea of its intellectual character. If, then, we obtain a general knowledge of the countenances of individuals,—for it is in the features that the soul's expression is chiefly found,—we may be said to have the general or typical character of a race.

To extract the common element from many faces alike in most respects, is the problem. This for the unaided eye is next to impossible. The stereoscope would remove the difficulty in part by superposing two pictures, thereby doubling the common element and rendering it more prominent. A battery of magic lanterns, say nine in number, so arranged as to throw their disks of equal brightness on exactly the same part of the screen, would give better results. For, by introducing into each lantern slides of the faces we wish to examine, we would have nine images blended into one. What is common to all would have the full brilliancy; what is found in three would be but one-third as brilliant, consequently less noticeable, and what belongs to one alone would have the light of but one lantern and would be comparatively out of notice.

By this means we would obtain the type or generic portrait of nine different individuals. But from nine it would not be just to judge of a race. In order, then, to superpose many pictures, Mr. Galton had recourse to Photography. His first care was to choose portraits of the same general character. The lighting and pose of the head should be the same in all; similar pose, for the common features should come out as nearly together as possible; like lighting, for different lights, even on one subject, give sometimes marvellously different results. We must not look for a composite, as the union is termed, remarkably well-defined; not at all, for that would suppose the genus without its differences. The portraits being selected, fiducial or guide-lines are drawn on the ground glass of the camera. Galton's guides are two horizontal lines, passing, one through the points of contact of the lips, the other through the pupils of the eyes.

We have now the subjects arranged and centred; next comes the exposure,—each portrait is in turn placed before the sensitive plate of the camera, and allowed to act upon it for a very short time. The exact duration necessary for each of these momentary exposures will vary with the depth of tone of the print to be copied, but should be so proportioned as to give each of the objects an equal share in the result. The development is the same as for ordinary negatives. Living subjects may also be taken, and, perhaps, with more pleasing results, using always the guide-lines to superpose the most expressive features of the face, the

eyes, and the mouth. Thus we obtain a type, a generic picture, one that resembles many, but is really the portrait of no single one.

Some very interesting studies, thus obtained, were exhibited by Galton; notably, a composite of consumptives, and a remarkable one of convicts. The latter does not give the "typical criminal," but the man inclined to crime, since we get that which underlies the varieties of criminal expression. Many details of ingenious manipulation,—especially the method of simplifying reiterated focusing,—might be given, but would not, perhaps, be of interest to the general reader. Those who desire fuller information on the subject are referred to Galton's "Inquiry into the Human Faculty."

GEOLOGY.

Flood Rock Explosion as an Artificial Earthquake.

Among the great problems of geological study still under discussion, is that of ascertaining the interior constitution of our globe; and to the solving of this has been brought the testimony of all the volcanic and seismic phenomena which scientists have been able to investigate. Of these, that of earthquakes has excited a more than scientific interest, in view of the immense loss to life and property resulting from the terrible earth-shakings of 1884 in Spain, and of 1883 at Krakatao. In connection with the late explosion at Flood Rock, in the East River, a number of observations have been made which will certainly prove of interest, and, possibly, of some scientific value in this regard. The theory of earthquake-communication, accepted upon thoroughly well-established grounds, is briefly this: From the origin of disturbance, as a centre, are propagated, spherically, a series of alternate compressions and re-acting expansions, closely analogous to the waves of sound and of light, and exhibiting with them the characteristic phenomena of reflection, interference and refraction; these, in consequence of the analogy, have very properly been styled earth-waves. Now, if we consider a series of such shell-like waves arising from a focus beneath the surface, it will be seen that the surface cuts them, as any plane would cut a sphere, and plane circles of disturbance are the result, so that the effect produced upon the surface is as if a series of circular waves were propagated in all horizontal directions, with a common centre at a point on the surface vertically over the focus. This supposes a homogeneous medium. Of course, if the medium be more elastic in one direction than in that perpendicular to it, the wave will move elliptically; and if the elasticity in one direction be made null, the wave-direction reduces to a line. Now, one of the problems proposed is to determine the velocity with which these surface-waves travel; for, when the focus is not far below the ground, their velocity and that of the spherical waves may be taken to coincide. Mallet, of the British Association, the distinguished authority on seismic subjects, long since experimented with the distant explosion of a keg of gunpowder buried in the ground, timing the shock felt, and comparing with the time of explosion as transmitted

to him by telegraph. He announced as the result of his experiments that the velocity of the earth-wave was 825 feet per second in sand, 1225 in slate, and 1665 in granite. These experiments were, of a necessity, on a small scale. The late explosion at Flood Rock, however, offered a unique opportunity for similar observation, one that could scarcely be excelled, save by a natural earthquake. Flood Rock is, or was,—for it is now no more,—an island in Long Island Sound, of about nine acres in extent, and containing some 275,000 cubic yards of solid rock, which was to be sundered with explosives, and reduced to fragments of a size for dredging. The agents used were dynamite and rackarock, the latter being a highly explosive mixture of powdered chlorate of potash and coal-oil or tar. The amount of blasting material used in the mine summed up 290,000 pounds, nearly 150 tons, and, had gunpowder been the agent, five times that weight would have been required. Now, when this was ignited by means of an electric spark, which caused the simultaneous explosion of the entire quantity wherewith the mine was charged, and the rock was disrupted with a dull roar, and an immense mass of water was hurled up into the air, to a height of nearly 200 feet, the accompanying shock might not unnaturally be compared with a diminutive earthquake. To note the time of communication of the earth-tremor, General Abbot, of the Engineer Corps, established on Long Island a line of points of observation, all of which communicated by telegraph with the scene of the explosion, as well as with one another. Moreover, some fourteen observatories, within a radius of 200 miles, were on the watch for the trembling of the earth. Add to this, that Professors F. W. Clarke, T. C. Mendenhall and H. M. Paul were stationed, the two former on Ward's Island, and the latter on Staten Island, to time the passing wave. The observing instruments used on the occasion were chiefly of two kinds,—the mercury-cup and the platinum-wire seismoscope. The former is simply a vessel of mercury, from the surface of which a pencil of light is reflected through a series of pin-holes in an opaque diaphragm, the slightest jarring of the mercury producing a perceptible blur in the projected image of the pin-holes. For greater delicacy this image is studied through an adjustable telescope, which is, itself, secured against all accidental displacement. The other method is with a seismoscope, of an improved form, according to the design of Mr. Kübel, the mechanician of the United States Geological Survey, and substantially amounts to keeping an electric circuit open by resting one of the connecting wires on the point of a needle so delicately balanced that the slightest tremor of the system moves it from its position of equilibrium, thereby allowing the wire-point to fall into a mercury-cup, and close the circuit. The current of the closed circuit produces the registry of the jar, and, in connection with a chronograph, will mark the precise second of its occurrence. Unhappily, an unavoidable delay of nearly fourteen minutes occurred in the discharge of the mine at Flood Rock, and some of the observers, either fancying that the event had taken place and the earth-wave had spent itself without reaching them, or mistaking for it a slight tremor, which, singularly

enough, happened to be felt almost coincidently with the previously determined time of the explosion, ceased to keep on the alert, and were caught unprepared when the shock really came. However, the passage of the wave was timed successfully at Harvard, Princeton, Columbia and Yonkers, at Ward's Island, and along the Long Island points; so that we may yet hope to have satisfactory deductions. There is a peculiar interest attached to the result, from the fact that, in 1876, at the Hallet's Point explosion, General Abbot's corps took like observations, and his report announced the velocity of the wave as from 5000 to 8000 feet per second. This differed so largely from the estimates of Mallet and others, that doubts were thrown upon its accuracy. The report of the present experiment is looked forward to with expectation as an arbiter of the correctness of the 1876 estimates. The results will be made public as soon as they can be correctly ascertained from all the reports received.

Book Notices.

SCEPSIS SCIENTIFICA; OR, CONFEST IGNORANCE THE WAY TO SCIENCE: In an Essay of the Vanity of Dogmatizing and Confident Opinion. By *Joseph Glanvill, M.A.* Edited, with Introductory Essay, by *John Owen.* London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

This is the title of a book which was written in the latter half of the 17th century, and which is now republished. Its general character may be sufficiently concluded from its title, "Scepsis Scientifica." Although what is now "modern skepticism" was then but in its infancy, this advocate of doubt makes no slight progress along what is, at present, the beaten track of error. As a necessary step in his undertaking, he gives much of his space to attacking the Aristotelian philosophy, a system which is opposed to erroneous speculations, and which predominated in the schools outside the Church, even after the religion which had adopted it and preserved it from pagan teachers had been cast aside by the so-called Reformation. But this magnificent structure of human reason—one so opposed to the vagaries and errors of the intellect—could not long be retained in the study of those who "liked not to have God in their knowledge," and who, having first rejected the truths that are supernatural and revealed, next, by a gradual process, abandoned also the truths of the natural order, until it has come to pass, in our day, that leaders of skeptical thought assert all knowledge to be relative, mutable, and illusory, and the unchangeable truth to be an obsolete fiction.

It is manifest, therefore, that a book which prepares the way for such unsound and irrational conclusions can be no real cause of good to science. Nor is the absence of true and immutable principles concealed by a matchless beauty of style, as was the case with Hume, for the author's language is quaint, often affected, and decidedly short of classic perfection.

It must not be supposed, however, that the book contains nothing that is good, true, or useful; there are portions which show the author to have been an acute and vigorous thinker, and which are strikingly at variance with advanced skeptical opinions of to-day. Though he is opposed to whatever is Aristotelian, he yet adopts, perhaps unconsciously, much of the philosophical system he condemns. Indeed, it is not too much to say that the best portions of his work are those in which he reproduces the thoughts of the Grecian sage. To instance: "To say that God doth eminently contain all those effects in his glorious simple essence, that the creature can produce or act by such a faculty, power, or affection, is to affirm him to be what he is, Infinite. Thus to conceive that he can do all those things in the most perfect manner, which we do upon *understanding*, *willing*, and *decreeing*, is an apprehension suitable to his idea; but to fix on him the formality of *faculties*, or affections, is . . . . . contradictory to his Divinity."

This is exactly the teaching of Aristotle, followed by the great schoolmen, who held that all the perfections of created natures are precontained, in an absolutely simple and preëminent manner, in the First Cause of those natures, but that no perfection of any creature can be affirmed of God in an identical and univocal sense.

The 22d chapter of the "Scepsis Scientifica" is an attempt to show that the Aristotelian philosophy is opposed to the doctrines of the Christian religion, and otherwise full of inconsistencies. The following charges are made without proof to sustain them: "[Aristotle] affirms that he [God] knows not particulars. He denies that God made anything, or can do anything but move the heavens. He affirms that it is not God, but nature, chance, and fortune that rule the world. That he is tied to the first orb, and preserves not the world, but only moves the heavens; and yet elsewhere, that the world and heavens have infinite power to move themselves. He affirms the soul cannot be separated from the body because it is its form. . . . . That the soul perishes with the body, and that there is neither state nor place of happiness after this life is ended."

These accusations are misrepresentations of Aristotle's real teaching. The illustrious Grecian philosopher proves, with demonstrative force, that the First Cause of the universe is a supreme and all-powerfull intelligence; that he freely produced the world according to a preconceived and infinitely wise plan. That, having produced it, he conserves and governs it with an eternal power and wisdom, and that his providence and universal efficiency reach even to, and influence, the most distant and comparatively most insignificant effect. It is true that Aristotle held that the world, though created, was yet produced *ab æterno*. But this nowise conflicts with, nor weakens the demonstrative efficacy of his doctrine that the world is completely an effect, and that its First Cause freely and intelligently produced it from nothing, albeit *ab æterno*.

It is a fact, worthy of reflection, that the highest and most comprehensive conceptions which Christian philosophers have derived from human reason to express the existence, nature, and attributes of the Deity, are nothing else than the unchangeable demonstrations of Aristotle. Of all past philosophers, it was most conspicuously Aristotle who investigated the highest rational truths, pursued them to their deepest and soundest conclusions, and finally rested our knowledge of these subjects upon its ultimate basis of irrefragable certainty. It ill becomes Christians, therefore, who have received from the Grecian sage what is best in the province of unaided human reason, to forget the source whence this golden inheritance of learning has been derived; far less does it become

them, from a misconception of what is taught in the writings of Aristotle, to turn upon him and charge him with doctrines so opposed to reason and common sense.

Among the profound and guiding thoughts which discover the master mind of the Greek philosopher, are those that he elaborated, and transmitted, from age to age, concerning the human soul; this he proves to be the formal and actuating principle of the body (*forma corporis*), a proposition which has been reaffirmed in a definition of the Church. But though he declares the human soul to be the actuating and life-giving principle of the body, he yet distinguishes it clearly from all inferior principles of activity and life; the human soul alone, differently from inferior active principles, has an intrinsic, distinct, and self-supporting existence; it exists *per se*. Hence, the intellectual soul alone can continue to exist when separated from the body. This doctrine, as is manifest, is far removed from teaching "that the soul perishes with the body." Aristotle, speaking the language of irrefutable reason, declares that the intellectual soul of man is a complete substance, capable of existence when separated from the body, and naturally imperishable.[1] Limiting his assertions to what is rigorously matter of proof, he does not discuss the question, what will be the positive state of the soul after death. As this inquiry regards a future contingency that depends upon the free will of God, and in respect to which God was not limited to one way of determining, it is an inquiry to which human reason cannot return a demonstrative answer, and of which it cannot attain certainty except by Divine Revelation. Hence, Aristotle, whose object was the apodictic truth, which is necessary, immutable, and such that its opposite is impossible, wisely restricts his utterances to a declaration of the soul's simple, spiritual, and imperishable nature. Though reason convinces us that the life of the soul is absolutely independent of second causes, and that the soul is intrinsically capable of an immortal existence, yet we can know only by supernatural and revealed truth what positive disposition God will make of the soul after death; we know by infused faith that the blessed enjoy forever the beatific vision, that there is the terminable state of purgatory, and the unending state of those who have averted themselves from their ultimate supernatural destiny. These are truths which our unaided faculties could not discover with certainty; nay, we could not even know that we are destined for a supernatural end unless it had been revealed; much less could we assert demonstratively the positive condition of those who have reached it, or of those who have failed to reach it.

Accordingly, to censure Aristotle because he did not know nor teach truths such as these, is unreasonably and unjustly to condemn him; it is, moreover, to confuse the two orders of truth, the natural and the supernatural, and irrationally to suppose that human reason can supersede

---

[1] "Aristotle, 2 De An., dicit quod intellectus separatur a cæteris sicut perpetuum a corruptibili."—Scotus, Dis. 4, 43, 2.

"Si autem aliquid manet posterius, perscrutandum est. In quibusdam enim nihil prohibet, ut si est anima tale, non omnis sed intellectus: omne namque impossibile forsan."—Aristotle, 12 Met. T. C., 16.

"Aristotle says that the intellectual soul is distinguished from lower principles of life, just as what is perpetual is distinguished from what is perishable."

"But whether any formal and essential principle of real substances remains [intrinsically unchanged] after [the dissolution of the compound] inquiry is to be made. For in some composite beings there is nothing to prevent [such principles from surviving], as, if a soul is of this nature, then not every soul will [survive the dissolution of this compound], but only the intellectual soul. For that every soul [should survive] is perhaps impossible."

the Christian Church in its precise and essential office of teaching men revealed truth in order to their ultimate and supernatural destiny.

The fundamental error of the book whose title heads this notice, is to set forth doubt as a leading principle of philosophy, and one applicable especially to the deeper questions that arise in this province of knowledge. It is manifest that when doubt is made one of the premises of any argument, the conclusion can enunciate only what is doubtful. A means of avoiding such spurious argumentation would have been a judicious and closer study of the peripatetic philosophy; this would have dispelled the doubts which the skeptical author professes on many subjects, and it would have deterred him from imputing to Aristotle errors that the Stagirite did not defend.

THE CHAIR OF PETER; OR, THE PAPACY CONSIDERED IN ITS INSTITUTION, DEVELOPMENT AND ORGANIZATION, AND IN THE BENEFITS WHICH, FOR OVER EIGHTEEN CENTURIES, IT HAS CONFERRED ON MANKIND. By *John Nicholas Murphy, Roman Count*, author of "Terra Incognita." Popular Edition, with Much New Matter, and the Statistics brought down to the Present Time. London: Burns and Oates. New York: The Catholic Publication Society.

The author of this work states in the Preface to the edition that is before us that he has added "one hundred and thirty pages of new matter. These embrace a number of important subjects which were either omitted, or only briefly treated, in the previous edition. Among these are: The Greek Schism; The Life and Writings of Wycliff; The Mendicant Orders; The Art of Printing, and the Bible before the Reformation; Alleged Unworthy Popes; The Culturkampf, and Catholic Organization in Germany, Belgium, and other Countries; Further Evidence of the Belief in Papal Infallibility in the Past: Some Additional Important Particulars of the Pontificate of Pius IX.; and other Interesting and useful topics, bearing on the present time." As originally put forth, the work was a very able and valuable one. The additions above mentioned have greatly enhanced its value.

The writer, throughout his whole work, has carefully endeavored to avoid uttering a word that would be painful to the feelings of non-Catholics. This is no easy task to accomplish when writing on controverted subjects, some of which, too, are subjects of hot contention; yet, the writer has been admirably successful in his endeavor, and the fact that he has been thus successful—a fact which numerous non-Catholic critics have noticed and acknowledged—makes his work all the more useful, and will secure to it, we trust, a wider circulation and reading among non-Catholics as well as Catholics.

The labor involved in the preparation of this volume must have been enormous. The materials from which it is composed are immense in number, variety, and extent, and the work of sifting, arranging, and condensing them must have been correspondingly great. In dealing with disputed points, Mr. Murphy exhibits a fairness and candor which can scarcely fail to win the admiration even of opponents. He states objections clearly, and gives to them their full measure of weight and strength, and answers them squarely and without evasion. He neither shirks nor minimizes any of the reasons that have been urged against his positions. He makes great use, too, of the writings of learned Protestants and infidels, and shows from their testimony how untenable are the opinions respecting the Papacy which are commonly entertained by those non-Catholics who are less thoroughly learned or less regardful of truth.

Another very great merit of the work is the admirable distribution which

the author makes of his material. His subject is a vast as well as an important one, embracing a multitude of topics, and comprehending a multitude of disputed questions; yet the author, by the clear and happy arrangement of his matter, separates and keeps distinctly apart various issues which, if allowed to run into each other, would confuse the reader's thoughts, and weaken the strength of the argument.

As illustrating both the author's admirable plan and arrangement of topics, and also the wide scope and comprehensiveness of his work, we enumerate the most important chapters and the subjects they treat of:

After stating concisely, but very clearly, the Scriptural proofs of the Primacy of Peter, and the testimonies of the Early Fathers, the author cites numerous all-sufficient proofs that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome. After quoting numerous passages from ancient writers in proof, and giving an account of St. Peter's life and labors, as gathered from ancient tradition, he uses with great effect against Protestants who are "more zealous than learned," the declarations of Protestant writers, of high esteem among Protestants, such as Barrow, Cave, Whiston, Baratier, Pearson, etc., so that, to use the words of Whiston, the fact that St. Peter was in Rome is "so clear in Christian antiquity, that it is a shame for a Protestant to confess that any Protestant ever denied it."

Equally full and lucid is the treatment of "St. Peter's Successors in the See of Rome;" "The Relations of Popes with Councils;" "The Appellate Jurisdiction of the Holy See;" "The Greek Schism;" "The Origin of Temporal Power of the Popes, and its Growth;" "The Collapse of the Western Empire;" "The Donations of Pepin and Charlemagne," "The Diplomas of the Emperors Louis, Otho, and St. Henry;" "The Relations of the Popes and the Emperors;" and "The Vicissitudes of the Temporal Power in the Middle Ages;" all are discussed and explained with like clearness, ability, and fulness.

A distinct chapter is given to Pope St. Gregory VII., his pontificate, labors and contests, and the times in which he lived. The outcome of this chapter is a complete vindication of this holy and great Pontiff from the charges brought against him by prejudiced and superficial thinkers. The chapters on "The Temporal Power in the Twelfth Century," and in "Centuries XII. to XVIII.," are practically a continuation of the same general subject, and show, in a most lucid manner, that amid all the changes of society the temporal power of the Popes is not only necessary to the free and efficient action of the Church, but has ever been exerted for the reformation of human society, the restraint of lawlessness and tyranny, the promotion of morality, peace, and good order in society.

With like ability the author treats of the subjects of "The Great Schism of the West," of Wycliffe, of Luther, and the Great Protestant Secession, of the other leading Reformers, and of the Introduction of the Reformation into England.

Following these are interesting chapters on the Council of Trent, the Symbolic books of the Protestants, the Religious Census of Europe, the Effects of the Reformation in Protestant Countries, and the Art of Printing, and the Bible before the Reformation.

Finally, the author clinches his previous arguments, and adds to the completeness of his work, by successive chapters on the Pontificates of Pius VI., Pius VII., and Pius IX.; on Papal Infallibility, the Hierarchy, Ancient Papal Elections, Alleged Unworthy Popes, Cardinals, a Modern Papal Election, and Benefits conferred by the Papacy upon Mankind.

The last chapter is a concise statement of the attitude of the secular powers of almost every country of Europe to-day towards the Church,

and of their direct and indirect efforts to persecute and crush it. The conclusion of the whole exhibit, as expressed in the author's last sentence, is that "angry storms may rage, and the bark of Peter may be beaten and almost submerged by the winds and waves, but in it there reposes One, Who, should we tremble for its safety, may justly reproach us in the hallowed words, 'Why are you fearful, O ye of little faith.'"

THE NINE MONTHS: The Life of Our Lord in the Womb. By *Henry James Coleridge*, of the Society of Jesus. London: Burns & Oates. 1885.

This volume, though forming a part of "The Life of Our Life," by Rev. Father Coleridge, embraces a distinct and separate stage of the Incarnation. It reaches from the Annunciation to the eve of the Nativity, and comprises in its intention and scope the whole of the unborn Life of our Lord. This stage of His Life is a part of His infinite condescension, the period of His greatest humiliation and self-abasement. It is natural, therefore, that it should engage the thoughts and attract the adoring homage of devout Christians.

Moreover, this stage of our Divine Lord's human existence was the true foundation of that followed afterwards. On this account those Christians who ignore it are very generally wanting in an intelligence of the simplest truths of faith concerning the Incarnate Son of God. "The Babe of Bethlehem is like any other child to them, as He was to the people of Bethlehem itself, or as He was to the Egyptians among whom He dwelt for a time." This misconception leads to others, and extends to an inadequate idea of the whole Life, office and work of our Lord, who He is, and what He came to do.

Then, again, our Lord's Life, in itself, at this time, "reveals the work and office which He at once gave Himself to discharge towards His Father. The created existence which began at the moment of the Incarnation, was the greatest of the works of God. Holy Scripture speaks of our Lord as the Head and consummation of the whole creation. He was sent indeed on earth for the redemption of mankind, and for their instruction in the manner of serving God perfectly, but, as it is implied, His presence as Man added the crowning dignity to the creation as it was originally left. Only through Him could there be that perfect, intelligent, and worthy service to the Creator, which no one could give Him but a Divine Person. God's greatness and goodness and power and beauty and majesty required as their correlatives, so to speak, the most perfect intelligence, appreciation, gratitude, praise; and these had never been rendered to Him adequately, nor could they ever be so rendered, until the moment of the Incarnation. The Life which then began paid this homage and tribute of adoration and self-abasement, of oblation and thanksgiving. The soul of Jesus Christ was a living mirror which gave back to God the perfect representation of His glories and wonders and benefits, in an adoration of reverence, joy, and delight and gratitude which was of infinite merit and worth, because it was the homage of a Divine Person. In this consisted the gain to the glory of God which came about at the moment of the Incarnation."

This was the occupation and Life of our Lord during these nine months, when He did not begin as yet to redeem, or to atone, or to teach, in the ordinary way, as He did afterwards, but when He began from the very first moment to devote Himself to honoring and glorifying His Father by the most intense acts of love and adoration.

From all this we may also gather that "at the first moment of this

adorable Life was made the great oblation of Himself, of which the Scripture speaks, to undergo all that had been decreed for Him to suffer in order to repair the sins of all the world before the majesty of God. But the occupation of the Sacred Heart during these long months, an occupation never since intermitted, and never to cease for all eternity, was the employment of all His faculties of intelligence and affection upon the greatness and loveliness and majesty of God."

These nine months in the Womb of the Ever Blessed Virgin Mary are the time in our Lord's Life which seems most entirely given up to this employment. God was all in all. "Out of this Life in the womb, which had no external manifestation at all, there sprang all the beauties and charities of the after stages of the Holy Infancy, the Childhood, the Hidden Life at Nazareth, the Public Ministry, the Passion, the Risen and Sacramental and Glorious Life. It is this Life which continues now in Heaven where He sits at the right hand of God, and in order that earth may not be without this continual and most perfect worship, He remains among us on the altar not only to be the food and consolation of the devout souls who receive Him and live by Him, but also that from Him may rise up, day after day and night after night, as long as the world lasts, His own most loving adoration, most powerful intercession, and most intelligent praise."

These considerations, which we have partly stated in the words of Father Coleridge, but with much less fulness and clearness than he has expressed them, have caused him to prepare the volume before us. There was also another consideration in his mind. It was this: That "another and momentous fruit of an intelligent devotion to this part of the Sacred Infancy is to be found in the light which it throws on the position of the Blessed Mother of our Lord in the Kingdom of her Divine Son, His dependence on her and union with her in the natural order, the universality of her graces, and the supreme perfection of her virtues."

The comprehensiveness and also the particularity of Father Coleridge's treatment of his all-important and momentous subject, may be inferred from the heads under which he considers it. His work is divided into fourteen chapters, which respectively treat of The Salutation of the Angel, The Trouble of Mary, The Son of David, "How Shall This Be Done?" The Conception by the Holy Ghost, The Fiat of Mary, Our Lord's Life in the Womb, The Visitation, The Canticle of Mary, The Nativity of St. John, The Canticle of Zachary, The Opening of St. Matthew's Gospel and his object as different from that of St. Luke, and also God's dealing with St. Joseph; The Trial of St. Joseph, The Expectation of our Lord's Nativity. Following the author's reflections on these subjects is a Harmony of the Gospels respecting them, and following this is an Appendix containing Heads of Meditation on the Life of our Lord in the Womb.

To those who are at all acquainted with Father Coleridge's writings on the Gospels and the Life of our Blessed Redeemer, it is needless to say that this volume is the fruit of careful and laborious research into and collation of all that has previously been written on the subject by the most approved theologians of the Church, and also of prayerful and devout study and meditation on the part of the author himself. It is a work which cannot fail, if read with a devout spirit (and with no other spirit can this profound mystery be approached without sacrilege), to increase the reverence and arouse the adoration of the reader for our Divine Lord, as well as enlighten his mind as to the profound, the unfathomable mystery, yet at the same time the glorious revelation of truths, which are comprised in the Incarnation.

ELEMENTS OF PHILOSOPHY, COMPRISING LOGIC AND ONTOLOGY, OR GENERAL METAPHYSICS. By *Rev. Walter H. Hill, S.J.*, Professor of Philosophy in the St. Louis University. Seventh Revised Edition. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. London: Washbourne, 18 Paternoster Row.

Father Hill's book is so well known that an extended notice of it is unnecessary. When it is remembered that speculative and abstract subjects, which belong essentially to higher learning, are not the ones that the majority of men have either the time or the inclination to pursue, and that, notwithstanding this fact, the present work has, in a short time, reached its seventh edition, it is abundant evidence of a purpose happily conceived and brilliantly accomplished. The signal success which has attended this excellent educational treatise is owing to the intrinsic merit of the book; for it compendiously reproduces the system of logic and the leading metaphysical topics proposed and established by the old masters of thought. Contributing, also, to this success was the real want which existed for just such a text-book in our language. The author of the "Elements of Philosophy" was peculiarly well-fitted for the work he undertook, as his special occupation for the last thirty years has been the study and teaching of philosophy. In this employment his method is as felicitous as it is comprehensive and effectual; to pursue every discussion until it rests upon those clear and immutable first principles which are the basis of all reasoning and inquiry. Indeed, a subject can be known adequately and comprehensively only then, when it is surveyed in the light of its absolutely first and unchangeable principles; these effectually satisfy the intellect of man in its quest for truth, for they leave open no ulterior question, no possibility of error or deception.

Father Hill is a Jesuit, a fact which, of itself, guarantees the thoroughness of his book. He has not written to defend any pet theory of philosophy, nor is he attached to any philosophical system in a mere party spirit, but he has mastered and presented to the English-speaking public the great and catholic truths of human reason, which guided aright the speculations of Aristotle, and enabled St. Thomas to become the prince of Christian philosophers. One of these time-honored truths of metaphysics the author thus states: "The uncreated essence of God is the commensurate or adequate object of the divine intellect; spiritual or angelic essence, *i.e.*, created immaterial essence, is the proportioned object of angelic intellect; the essence of the human soul is the connatural and proportioned object of the cognoscive soul when existing separated from the body" (p. 104).

This is the universal teaching of the Christian schools enlightened by the wisdom of Aristotle.[1] It is not, however, explicitly affirmed in the words just cited that the disembodied spirit of man can actually elicit an act of intellection by its own unassisted natural power, although it is, perhaps, a just inference from the writer's doctrine. For, if the connatural and proportioned object of the separated intellectual soul is

---

[1] "[Deus] . . . . honorabilissimum intelligit, . . .
Seipsum ergo intelligit."—*Arist. 12, Met. T. C., 50.*

"Ipse solus [Deus] seipsum perfecte comprehendit actu infinito et adæquato ipsi objecto quod est ipsa sua propria essentia."—*Scotus, Ibid., T. C., 39.*

"The adequate object of God's intellect is what is most excellent. . . . .

"It is, therefore, Himself.

"He, alone, perfectly comprehends Himself by an infinitely intelligent act, commensurate with its object, which is His own essence."

the essence of the soul itself, it should seem to follow that, to elicit an act of intellection, *i.e.*, actually to understand and to know, is naturally possible to the unembodied spirit. This, however, is not held by several authors, who argue that the absence of imagination renders actual intellection naturally impossible, and, by consequence, that the separated soul requires and receives supplementary infused ideas which enable it actually to understand.

This opinion is resisted by others, who conceive it as debasing the rational nature of man to take from it all power of eliciting its connatural and proportioned operation. They argue that thus to deprive the soul of the real faculty of completely forming ideas and knowing, is to reduce it in rank below inferior beings, all of which are perfectly fitted by nature for their respective essential operations. Hence, they conclude that the soul, being a complete substance, can, in its bodiless state, know the objects that it formerly knew, *i.e.*, can intellectually remember them; that it can, moreover, in a manner proper to its new condition of existence, but without supernatural aid, acquire the knowledge of objects that are unknown, if such objects are proportioned to it, and *objected* before it, within the sphere of its own natural light.[1] It can, accordingly, increase its knowledge by the acquisition of new and objectively real conceptions. The soul can also know itself then by a simple total and continuous self-presence, according to which it is entirely *objected* before itself, and completely visible even independently of any idea representing itself, and when no idea of any object is actually informing the intellect. Although this species of knowledge belongs to the disembodied soul as having a spiritual nature, yet it is not the distinctly rational operation by which the intellect knows objects; nor can it thus know any other object less intimate than self; and even its own substantial being, immediately and perfectly so beheld, will doubtless not be adequately comprehended. The completely rational mode of knowing *self*, or any other object, is by way of a mental *word*, or idea, actually informing the intellect and empowering it intrinsically to speak and understand its object. The word, or conception of the understanding, will then, also, express the intelligible essence of an object, its "quiddity," since the change of state which the soul undergoes will affect its cognoscive action only in relation to what is extrinsic to the cognitive faculty, and not as to what is intrinsic and essential to the act of knowing.

It would exceed the space at our disposal to discuss this subject fully. For further information upon this and other salient principles of metaphysics, the reader is referred to Father Hill's book. If the matter contained in this judicious philosophical manual is well fixed in the mind, and understood, the student of philosophy is put in possession of metaphysical truths that are the real safeguard against prevalent errors.

---

[1] "Nihil est in phantasmate propter quod sufficiat ad causandam speciem intelligibilem quin eminentius sit in re cujus est phantasma."—*Scotus Dist., 4, 45, 2.*

"Species intelligibilis eodem modo potest informare intellectum separatum sicut conjunctum."—*Ibid.*

"For concurring extrinsically in the production of an intellectual idea there is, in the fancy's representative likeness of an object, nothing that is not more eminently in the object itself which such likenesss reproduces."

"An intellectual concept can inform the intellect, and perfect it for knowing, as well when the soul is separated from, as when united to the body."

THE WORKS OF ORESTES A. BROWNSON: Collected and Arranged by *Henry F. Brownson*. Vol. XIX., Containing the Writings on Literature. Detroit: Thorndike Nourse, Publisher. 1885.

This last volume of Brownson's "*Collected Works*" is made up of thirty essays on different subjects connected with literature, chiefly American literature. The field of thought the author ranges over is a wide one, but he makes no random excursions through it. Whether he touches on religion, morals, politics, history, national characteristics, or other topics, his disquisitions always have a distinct purpose and an evident and direct relation to the subject under consideration. Some few of the papers in this volume were written and published before Dr. Brownson became a Catholic, but even they contain indications of the direction in which he was moving, and of the goal he subsequently reached. All the rest of them were produced since his conversion, and examine and discuss their respective subjects from a Catholic point of view.

An idea, though necessarily an imperfect one, can be formed of the scope of the volume from an enumeration of the titles of the most important papers it contains. There are three on American Literature; one on Carlyle's French Revolution; on Modern French Literature; The Scholar's Mission; Modern Idolatry; Schiller's Æsthetic Theory; Religious Novels; R. W. Emerson's Poems; Novel Writing and Novel Reading; Popular Literature; The Catholic Press; Catholic Secular Literature; The Vision of Sir Launfal (as misinterpreted by J. R. Lowell in his poem on the subject); Dana's Poems and Prose Writings; The Works of Daniel Webster; Bancroft's History of the United States; Wordsworth's Poetical Works; Liberal Studies; Catholicity and Literature; Etudes de Théologie; Literature, Love, and Marriage; Use and Abuse of Reading; Beecher's Norwood; Religious Novels and Woman *Versus* Woman; Catholic Popular Literature; Women's Novels.

Nor are the papers on the topics superficial and discursive essays. They are careful, keenly analytical, and thorough studies of their respective subjects, replete with the fruits of extensive learning, mature reflection, and profound reasoning. We know of no disquisitions in the English language on the subjects which these papers treat of that are more discriminating, more thoughtful, more exhaustive.

It has recently been said that if Dr. Brownson had written in more polished and cultured style and with more sweetness of temper, he would have exercised much greater influence. We are of an entirely opposite opinion. As regards style, Brownson's writings are models of pure, limpid, vigorous English. His style is beautiful in its simplicity and its transparent clearness. It is admirably suited, too, to the nature of the subjects discussed and the manner in which they are treated. As regards sweetness of temper, Brownson is never ill-humored, and in his most earnest discussions and vigorous controversies Brownson was the soul of honor and honesty. The petty tricks of logical fence he understood thoroughly and just as thoroughly he despised them, never condescending to employ them. He was straightforward, candid, conceding to his opponents every point and position which truth demanded, and just as stubbornly refusing to concede that which would have compromised the truth. As for meretricious rhetorical ornaments, they would have been utterly out of place in his writings, and would have weakened instead of strengthened his arguments.

And just these characteristics of Brownson's style and method of reasoning secured him an "audience," a clientage of readers, while he lived

and wrote, not only in this country, but wherever the English language is spoken, select it may be, but more thoughtful and more earnest than any other English writer of his age; and now that he has passed away from earth, they give to his writings a permanent value which the productions of very few other authors possess.

It is a great mistake to think that persons who are thoroughly in earnest, though of opposite opinions, will be placated in their opposition by complimentary phrases or by half concealing an unpleasant truth with flowers of rhetoric. Honest opponents (and none others are worthy of consideration) are pleased rather than offended by the exhibition of straightforward honesty on the part of those whom they are opposing. As in days of chivalry a knight had all the higher respect for the knight arrayed against him, whether in the peaceful tournament or in a conflict for life and death, who with spear or sword or battle-axe did his best; as to-day the true soldier regards all the more highly those of his foes who fight most valiantly; so those who are earnest and honest (though in error) esteem all the more warmly and will read and consider all the more appreciatively the arguments of opponents who meet them honestly and fairly, who call things by their plain names, and state their positions and put their arguments frankly and strenuously, without minimizing, and yet without malice. In the words of Sir Walter Scott describing William of Deloraine,

> They "ne'er bore grudge for stalwart blow,
> Given in fair fight with gallant foe."

Orestes A. Brownson was a man for his age and for his country. He wrote for his age and country (for he was intensely an American), and for men of his age and country who were able and willing to think. That was his special work, the work which "his hand found to do." And well did he do that work. And now that he is dead do his works still live and flourish, and long will continue so to do, we warmly and sincerely trust and believe.

Life of St. Philip Benizi, of the Order of the Servants of Mary (1223–1285). With Some Account of the First Disciples of the Saint. By the *Rev. Peregrine Saulier*, Priest of the same Order. Translated from the French, and Revised by the same Author. London: Burns & Oates. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Company. 1886.

The fact of the year 1885 being the sixth Centennary of the holy death of St. Philip Benizi, suggested to the Right Rev. Father-General of the Order of Servants of Mary, that the occasion was a fitting one for preparing and publishing a new Life of that eminent Saint, for those which had been previously published were out of print, and, moreover, were written in a style that was little suited to the taste of the present age. Accordingly, he requested Rev. Father Saulier to prepare such a Life, and the volume before us is the fruit of his compliance with the request of his Superior.

In the preparation of his work, the Rev. author availed himself (as we learn from his modest and self-deprecatory preface) of all accessible sources of reliable information. In this he was greatly aided by the Right Rev. General of the Order, and several of the members. He consulted not only the former Lives of the Saint that are still extant, but also the original documents upon which they were based, and the references to such documents in other authentic writings where the documents themselves have been destroyed. Of the extent of this destruction the Rev. author, among other instances, refers to the Convent of Sienna, in

which more than eleven thousand precious manuscripts were destroyed in an incendiary fire kindled by some ruthless soldiers. The Rev. author was also furnished by the Very Rev. General of the Order with the Processes of Canonization of the holy Saint Philip Benizi, drawn up at Florence, in 1619, and at Todi, in 1620. These two documents contain authentic information as to the actions and virtues of the Saint, as well as of his miracles, and are of inestimable historical value. From these, from the annals of the Order, and from other authentic sources of information, the work before us has been prepared.

The Order of the Servants of Mary is but little known in this country. It may be well, therefore, to say that, like all the Religious Orders of the Church, it had its origin in the pious desire and resolve of its founders to follow the Evangelical counsels, and live with greater detachment from the world than is ordinarily possible to those who continue amid the distractions of secular life. Like the other Religious Orders, too, it had certain specific purposes and objects to promote. In the Order of the Servants of Mary, these were special love, devotion, and reverence for the Ever Blessed Virgin Mary, the Holy Mother of God.

The Order was founded in the early part of the thirteenth century by seven rich merchants of Florence, who renounced all their worldly possessions, and retiring to Monte Senario, near Florence, lived there in poverty. They possessed no individual property, and practiced great austerities. Their first Superior was the Blessed Bonfilio Monaldi, one of the original founders of the Order. At first, it grew slowly; but after St. Philip Benizi was received into it, in 1254, first as a lay brother (concealing his distinguished intellectual gifts and his learning), and in the course of a few years ordained to the Priesthood, and soon afterwards raised to the office of General, the Order increased rapidly and spread beyond Italy into France, Flanders, Friesland, Saxony, and other parts of Germany.

St. Philip died on the Octave of the Feast of the Assumption. He was canonized by Clement X., in 1671. But Clement X. died before the publication of the bull of canonization, and it was not published until 1724, by Benedict XIII.

The work before us gives a clear and interesting account of the life and labors of this eminent Servant of Mary, of his innocent and virtuous life from his youth onwards, his unaffected and profound humility, his temptations and interior conflicts and the manner in which he triumphed over them; his avoidance of all ecclesiastical dignities (among which was his probable elevation to the Papal chair); his missions into foreign countries; his zeal and devotion; of the miracles he performed whilst living, and of others that were wrought after his death through invoking his intercession. It also contains succinct sketches of the lives of the seven Blessed Founders of the Order, and of its progress and condition in France and Germany.

The Fall of Constantinople; Being the Story of the Fourth Crusade. By *Edwin Pears, LL.B.* New York: Harper & Bros. 1885.

The way of the special pleader is hard, almost as hard, indeed, as that of the transgressor; and justly so, for he is most frequently a transgressor himself. Mr. Pears, who announces himself on the title-page of his book as a "barrister-at-law, late president of the European bar at Constantinople, and Knight of the Greek Order of the Saviour," is nothing if not a special pleader, and a very aggravated type of the species he is, too. Seized with a "holy horror" of the "unspeakable

Turk," against whom he is as severe as the most enthusiastic Gladstonian dare be, he has undertaken the hopeless task of rehabilitating the Greek Empire of the Middle Ages. Except in this respect his book is in no way remarkable, though he evidently has read a great deal of the literature of his subject, than which, he truly says, "no other historical question has had devoted to it" "during the last twenty-five years," "the labors of an equal number of illustrious historical students." If he intends to class himself among these, he ranks entirely too high in his own estimation; for he has done nothing to settle the literary controversy which "has been waged, and is still waging, about several of the important questions which have arisen in connection with the subject."

The purely narrative part of his work is pretty creditably done, but not at all so well as is the same story by Gibbon, Finlay, Michaud, and some other writers not so well known as these. It is when he attempts to elucidate the philosophy of history that he shows his weakness—here, indeed, he fails utterly. Two of the main points which he attempts to make are, that politically and morally the Eastern Empire was strong enough to permanently make successful resistance against Moslem aggression, and that the Latin Conquest of Constantinople in 1204 was the direct cause of that city's falling into the power of the Turks in 1453. As to the former, a sufficient refutation is contained in Mr. Pears' own pages. The Greeks of that time he shows to be corrupt, treacherous and fickle. Intrigues against the throne, and the violent substitution of one ruler for another were as common as in the worst days of the old Roman Empire, when the wearer of the imperial purple was the creature of the soldiery, and political morality was at its lowest ebb. If there be any valid reason for the second contention, why had so many rich provinces formerly under Greek dominion fallen into the hands of the Mohammedans? And why were the Greeks barely able to withstand the attacks of a mere handful of the invading followers of Islam, whilst the Crusaders were struggling with the great body of the common enemy in other directions?

We may all admit that the deflection of the Fourth Crusade from its original destination to the attack on Constantinople was a most deplorable mishap, a flagrant and entirely reprehensible crime if it was the result of a bargain with the enemies of the Christian name. But the Greeks had given ample cause for bitter feeling against themselves on the part of the Latins. More than once they had acted treacherously towards the Crusaders of the earlier expeditions, and allowed disaster to overtake them when by honest coöperation both could have inflicted blows on the Turks from which they would not easily recover. The Grecian jealousy of the western invaders brought ruin upon both; but the carrying of the war into Asia Minor and Palestine by the Latins delayed the establishment of Mohammedan power at Constantinople and possibly prevented the subjection of the whole of Europe to it. The ease with which the city was taken by the Latins showed its utter weakness, and indicated what the result would be were a commander like Saladin to appear before it with his mighty hosts, for whom its western conquerors were no more than a match. Fruitless, unfortunate and criminal, then, as was the Fourth Crusade, its effect was not what Mr. Pears wants to make it appear. So utterly does he fail to establish his thesis that some friend might properly suggest to him the propriety of studying a treatise on logic before attempting another essay in the philosophy of history. Then by careful study he might be able to ascertain that the new Rome fell as the old had done, as much from its own corruption as from the shocks of attacking hordes of invaders.

THE KEYS OF THE KINGDOM, OR THE UNFAILING PROMISE. By the *Rev. James J. Moriarty, LL.D.*, Pastor of St. John the Evangelist's Church, Syracuse, New York, and author of "Stumbling Blocks made Stepping Stones on the Road to the Catholic Faith," etc. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Company; London: Burns & Oates.

The motive thought in the author's mind for writing this book seems to have been suggested, as we infer from the introductory chapter, by a perusal of Mallock's work on the question, "Is Life Worth Living?" Rev. Dr. Moriarty argues, and correctly argues, that, "if life be really worth living, it is only because of religion, the key it affords to the mysteries of life, the motives of action which it furnishes, the innumerable aids it supplies, the consolations it gives, and the well-grounded hopes it holds out of a brighter, undying life in the future."

Taking this as an accepted conclusion, and using it as a starting point, the author presses the questions, and answers them, severally, in successive chapters: "Is Religion Worthy of Man's Study?" "If so, What Religion?" "By Whom was the True Religion Founded?" "What Rule of Faith was Laid Down?" "What Marks, Notes, and Characteristics Distinguish the True Church from All Others?"

The spirit in which the author writes will be sufficiently shown by the following statement, which we give in his own language: "In treating of the characteristics of the Catholic faith, we shall necessarily have to refer to opposing systems of religion, and to their manifest lack of these shining qualities, by which Christ wished His to be forever distinguished. Truth is not always agreeable; yet, for the sake of immortal souls that are perishing for want of the light, and are living in 'the darkness of the shadow of death,' it should be told plainly, yet kindly. Hence, in whatever we have written in this book, it is certainly not our intention to offend; and, when we have had something to say that might appear harsh to those not of the household of faith, we have endeavored to select the opinions of non-Catholic writers, and let those speak who cannot be accused of any partiality towards our Holy Mother, the Church."

This statement (and in it we recognize the prevailing spirit of Catholic writers, even on subjects fiercely controverted by opponents of the true faith) shows at once the prudence and the charity of the writer.

Whatever excuse or reason there may have been in past times for violent denunciation of Protestants because of their frequently malicious assaults upon Catholics, and their glowing misrepresentations of the doctrines and history of the Catholic Church, the need and use for that kind of controversy has almost entirely, if not entirely, passed away. Protestants, generally, are still prejudiced, it is true, against the Catholic religion, and many of them are still bigoted. But their prejudices and bigotry now are not, at least not so much as in times past, the result of malice and self-will, as of the influence and effect of their wrong education and the power exerted upon them (unconsciously to themselves, it is to be hoped), of the false and delusive Protestant traditions, amidst which they have grown and by which their thoughts and sentiments have been shaped and moulded. Kindness, gentleness, forbearance and charity, therefore, are more potent instrumentalities in leading them to a knowledge of their errors, than heated argument, or the expression of indignation, however just and well-grounded that indignation might be.

With these preliminary remarks upon the general spirit of the work before us, we pass on to a consideration of its contents. After answering affirmatively, in the first chapter, the question, "Is Religion Worthy of Man's Study," the writer considers the question, "What Rule of

Faith Was Laid Down by Christ?" The treatment of this all-important subject is highly satisfactory. It is simple, direct, and clear.

The subsequent chapters of the work are occupied with proving that the Church of Christ is One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic.

A Literary and Biographical Dictionary or Bibliographical History, of the English Catholics. From the Breach with Rome, in 1534, to the Present Time. By *Joseph Gillow*. Volume II. London: Burns & Oates; New York: The Catholic Publication Society Company.

The first volume of this work we noticed favorably in the Review for October, 1885. Its object, as defined by the author, is to "present, in most ready and convenient form, a concise record of the literary efforts, educational struggles, and the sufferings for religion's sake of the Catholics in England down to the present time, from that of Henry VIII.'s breach with Rome."

The history of Catholicity in England during this period, and of the sufferings which English Catholics had to endure, is only beginning to be known. What has heretofore been written on the subject, has, mainly, consisted of special treatises, bringing out particular phases of it, or confined to certain localities in England. And even these works have, owing to various circumstances, had a very limited circulation. Of late years, however, a praiseworthy activity has been displayed by English Catholic writers in this important field of literary labor. The work before us, of which the first two volumes have been published, when completed (as the author intends it to be in five volumes), will be a very valuable addition to what has been already accomplished. It is a compilation from the labors of previous writers, original documents, catalogues of public and private libraries, booksellers' and sale catalogues, with information derived also from personal sources. It consists of bibliographical and biographical notices, with criticisms, "of all deceased Catholic authors, martyrs, confessors of the faith, cardinals, bishops, vicars apostolic," etc., artists, including "painters, sculptors, architects, musicians, and actors," and, in like manner, "members of the legal, medical, military, naval and scientific professions, who have risen to eminence, in spite of legislative restriction, and of an intolerant public spirit, which sought to prohibit Catholics from enjoying the position to which their merits would otherwise have entitled them, also find a place in the work." To give additional value to the contents, "the authorities, from which the biographies are chiefly drawn, are carefully noted."

The first volume comprises, according to the alphabetical arrangement the author adopts, the biographical notices of Catholics from A to C, both inclusive. The second volume continues the work to Grad.

Stories of Duty. A Book for Boys and Girls. By *Maurice Francis Egan*, author of "Life Around Us," "The Theatre and Christian Parents," etc. Phila.—delphia: Fasy, Comber & Co., 106 South Thirteenth Street. 1885.

This is a volume of pleasant yet thoughtful stories, which, we are sure, boys and girls will be delighted to read. The scenes and incidents all belong to life in our own country. On this account they are not the less interesting, and also will be all the more suggestive and profitable. We need *American* Catholic literature, particularly for children, and are glad to see that Mr. Egan recognizes this want and is laboring to do his part to supply it. We heartily commend this work as a suitable present from parents to children.